The Communist

20c MAY 1943

MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

•

THE ANTI-SOVIET CONSPIRACY IN THE UNITED STATES
EARL BROWDER

•

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?
ROBERT MINOR

•

MARXISM, PRUSSIANISM, AND MR. WALLACE
V. J. JEROME

•

FORGE WORLD LABOR UNITY!
ROY HUDSON

•

CHICAGO REBUKES THE COPPERHEADS
MORRIS CHILDS

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARL BROWDER ON THE WAR

VICTORY—AND AFTER

Since publication early in November more than 200,000 copies of Earl Browder's inspiring war book, **Victory—and After** have been sold. Presenting the Communist position on the most vital problems arising from the war, it is a splendid guide for a more vigorous and effective prosecution of the war to total victory.

Popular Edition 50 cents

POLICY FOR VICTORY

A compilation of the speeches and writings of Earl Browder during the past year, which throws brilliant light on the major problems posed by the war, and on American foreign and domestic policies up to the present day.

Price 15 cents

IS COMMUNISM A MENACE?

Text of the recent debate between Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Party, and George Sokolsky, columnist of the New York **Sun**, held under the auspices of **New Masses**.

Price 10 cents

PRODUCTION FOR VICTORY

Trade unionists will benefit from this incisive discussion of such key problems of war production as manpower, raw materials, centralization of the war economy, utilization of small enterprises, increased labor productivity, incentive pay rates, the role of the trade unions for victory, and other vital questions.

Price 5 cents

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXII, No. 5 MAY, 1943

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM

EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

May Day Manifesto of the Communist Party		387
Note of the Soviet Government on the Decision to Suspend Relations With the Polish Government		394
Hitler's Polish Partners		396
The Anti-Soviet Conspiracy in the United States	*Earl Browder*	399
Forge World Labor Unity!	*Roy Hudson*	403
Marxism, Prussianism, and Mr. Wallace	*V. J. Jerome*	411
Chicago Rebukes the Copperheads	*M. Childs*	425
What Are We Fighting For?	*Robert Minor*	434
On Wage Stabilization *With a Reply by Gilbert Green*	*William and Pauline Young*	443
The New Stage in the Fight to Abolish the Poll Tax	*Theodore R. Bassett*	452
Thomas E. Dewey: His Record	*S. W. Gerson*	461
Under a "Socialist" Mantle	*Max Steinberg*	469

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW AND FORTHCOMING PAMPHLETS

Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings . $.25
With an introduction by **Dr. Philip Foner**

The Heritage of Jefferson 10
By **Claude G. Bowers, Earl Browder** and **Francis Franklin**

Karl Marx: His Life and Work 15
Reminiscences by **Paul Lafargue** and **Wilhelm Liebknecht**

Battle for America—1776-1861-1941 15
By **A. B. Magil**

The Real Rickenbacker 02
By **Sender Garlin**

300,000,000 Slaves and Serfs 10
By **Jurgen Kuczynski**

Farmers and the War 05
By **Anna Rochester**

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAY DAY MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

FELLOW AMERICANS!

Workingmen and Workingwomen!

This Spring, 1943, can be decisive for the outcome of the war and the future of humanity.

This is the thought that should be grasped with realism, courage and boldness by all American patriots. Especially should this be realized by American labor on this May Day, the traditional day of the world solidarity of labor, as our valiant soldiers fight to bring the North African campaign to its final phase.

For in the coming weeks and months will be decided the crucial issues:

Will America and Britain seize the present opportunity, made possible by the historic struggles of the Red Army, to invade Western Europe *now? Will America and Britain strike out now from our bases in England and Africa this spring and join with the Soviet Union in a two-front war against Hitler Germany?*

Or will America and Britain continue to hold back? Will we allow Hitler to gain time after his defeats at Stalingrad and elsewhere on the decisive Eastern Front? Will we allow Hitler to accumulate new striking power and once again seize the initiative in the Donets region, or in new drives through Spain, Turkey, or against Britain itself?

This is the grave decision which faces the entire nation, and especially the American working people.

Hitler and the Axis know their peril. They are striving to maintain "All Quiet on the Western Front."

If Hitler is allowed to continue concentrating his main forces to strike at our ally, the Soviet Union, without a major diversion in the west, new disasters face America and the world. The war will be prolonged. Our casualties will be enormously increased. Victory itself will be endangered.

By hesitation and delay in invading Europe, we forfeited our chance to crush Hitler in 1942. We cannot afford to miss our opportunity in 1943. In the interests of our national security we cannot allow the present situation to go on where the full weight of the war is placed upon one ally, the Soviet Union.

We must strike now from the Allied stronghold in England. We must extend our African offensive to Europe this spring. We must organize real coalition warfare of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain and strike at the Nazi beasts together, from all sides. And this, also, is the way to speed the defeat of the Japanese militarists.

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is time for American labor, the backbone of the nation, to face these realities and the stern duties that flow from them.

American labor gave May Day to the world in 1887 as the traditional day for uniting and strengthening the world brotherhood of labor in a common cause.

What greater common cause has American labor ever faced with its countrymen and its brothers of the world than the task of defending democratic liberties and national independence against the world-slavery of Hitlerism?

On this May Day, sixteen months after America entered the war for the defense of our national freedom against Axis aggression and domination—fighting months in which our country's prowess has been demonstrated in North Africa and Guadalcanal—the American working class faces the greatest responsibility in its history.

It now falls to labor to rouse and unite our country around our Commander-in-Chief to sweep aside all the obstacles which still delay the fulfillment of the American-Soviet-British agreement of June 11, 1942, and of the Casablanca decisions: *to invade Europe!*

On this May Day, the American working people should launch a nation-wide drive for the opening of the Second Front. Labor and the people should resolve to deal Hitler his death blow in 1943, crushing him in the vise of a two-front coalition attack on the European continent, thereby shattering the entire Axis.

* * *

What holds back the knockout blow which America together with our allies can and must deliver against the vital center of the Axis, against the Nazis in Europe? What holds back our government from carrying through its objectives to deliver its main blows first against the heart of the Axis—Hitler Germany?

In the first place it is the treacherous activities of the appeasers and defeatists. These forces still occupy influential positions in Congress, the State Department and in other high places. They oppose and delay the Second Front.

These pro-fascists are opposed to the destruction of Hitlerism. They seek at all costs to prevent coalition warfare. They strive to break the fighting alliance of our country with our Soviet and British allies, by fanning old prejudices and distrust, and by sowing discord over so-called post-war problems in order to prevent concerted military action for victory now. They work for a "negotiated peace" with Hitler's Axis. They are the Tories and Benedict Arnolds of 1943 who attack our Commander-in-Chief and seek to undermine our national unity and common war effort.

The un-American and anti-Soviet poison of these Copperheads has infected even some Administration circles. It has promoted dangerous ambiguities in our government's foreign policy. It has abetted an anti-United Nations policy of appeasement on the part of our State Department toward Hitler's satellites—Mannerheim Finland, Franco

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spain and the Peyroutons in North Africa.

The Western Front has also been delayed because the appeasers have tried to palm off our magnificent military landing in Africa as a Second Front. They have succeeded in influencing some Administration leaders into accepting the suicidal proposition that it is advisable to postpone an invasion of Europe until the Tunisian operation is completed, thereby allowing Hitler and Rommel to rob us of valuable time. They are likewise trying to divert America's military might from the decisive arena of the war in Europe, to the Pacific, the better to prolong Hitler's life and the Japanese war lords along with him.

In the forefront of their treacherous activity to avert a Second Front and prevent the unconditional surrender of the Axis, the defeatists of the stripe of Hoover-Hearst-Dies try to muddy the waters of American-Soviet friendship and unity. In the spirit of Hitler and Goebbels they are trying to resurrect the "bogey of Bolshevism" and to organize an anti-Soviet and a Red-baiting campaign.

On this May Day, the American people, and particularly labor, must maintain sharp vigilance against all anti-Soviet incitements, including such outrageous anti-Soviet plots as are being hatched in the "cordon sanitaire" intrigues of the Berle-Bullitt cliques. They must reject the anti-Soviet provocations such as have been organized recently by the *New Leader*-Dubinsky-Norman Thomas "Socialists" around the execution of two Polish Quislings, Alter and Ehrlich. For these anti-Soviet activities are part of the desperate effort of Hitler's friends to weaken the American-Soviet-British coalition and prevent or delay common fighting action against Nazi Germany and its satellites.

On this May Day, the American people must strengthen to the utmost the fighting alliance of the United States, our great Soviet ally and Great Britain! For this is the key to our common victory. We must consolidate the bonds of American - Soviet friendship and collaboration to win victory. We must greatly extend and speed the shipment of war supplies to the U.S.S.R. We must increase our aid to heroic China. We must reinforce the unity of all the United Nations. We must put an end to all appeasement tendencies in our foreign policy.

By the same token, the unity of American labor with the Soviet and British workers—the forging of world labor unity against Hitlerism —becomes a basic weapon, an immediate war necessity for the nation and labor. It is necessary to hasten the defeat of Hitler's Axis. It is essential to consolidate the alliance of the United Nations and peoples. *World labor unity is a key to victory.*

* * *

The American working people gave Washington his Valley Forge contingents. They gave Lincoln the troops and equipment to win on the battlefield and the political backing with which to rout the Copperheads and save the Union. The same duty,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only vastly greater, confronts the American people, especially the working class, its trade unions and its Communist Party, in this people's war of national liberation.

This May Day American labor is confronted with the duty of forging unity of action in its own ranks and of acting as the foremost champion and unifier of the nation, as the most resolute fighter against fascism. It is called upon to act as the vanguard in the camp of national unity for the solution of the nation's most urgent task—the march to battle against Hitler, center of the Axis.

It is in the immediate establishment of its own unity, of joint struggle and collaboration with all win-the-war Democrats, Republicans and other patriots, and in the forging of unity of action with the labor movements of other lands, that American labor will speed victory of the United Nations over Nazism-fascism and the defeatists and Quislings within our borders.

The American working class, urging the unity of all classes and groups for victory, has proved itself the class most capable of sacrifice and struggle, as the implacable foe of Hitlerism and its fifth column.

Yet American labor's decisive contributions to the winning of the war have been weakened by the absence of unity within its own midst. The Hutcheson-Woll-Lewis reactionaries and appeasers, as well as the anti-Soviet Social-Democrats, continue to promote division and carry into the labor movement the influence of the saboteurs of victory.

Because American labor has not yet cemented its own unity, nor developed sufficient political initiative, it has given ground to the reactionaries, the Soviet-baiters, and the other enemies of our country. It has enabled the defeatists and reactionaries in Congress to obstruct the government's war program and to make headway in a vicious attack against the labor movement.

Labor's lack of unity in turn spreads weaknesses to all other vital sectors of the war effort. It enables the reactionary "farm bloc" to deceive the working farmers and city middle classes. It leaves the way open for tendencies within the government to conciliate the appeasers and reactionaries. It plays into the hands of the inflationary profiteers, the apostles of profits-as-usual, and the labor baiters.

Above all it is the Axis, especially Hitler's reeling armies in Europe, who profit the most by the lack of labor's unity within its own ranks and with its brother labor movements of the United Nations.

For the costly result of the absence of labor unity is to play into the hands of those who wish to weaken national unity and to delay the opening of the Second Front; who wish to impede the solution of the problems of our war economy, the checking of inflation, as well as the curbing of the anti-Semitic and Jim-Crow activities of the fifth column.

That is why on this First of May, remembering that May Day was initiated by American labor through the A. F. of L. in 1887 to organize common action for labor's demands,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the fighters for labor unity will renew their efforts to develop everywhere the unity of action of the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods,—of Laborites, Communists, Democratic and Republican workers and adherents—of Negro and white workers.

This is why the American working class should dedicate itself on May Day to advance the struggle for united labor action on the field of production, on the legislative and electoral fronts, in the fight for the Second Front and the solidarity of world labor and the United Nations. This is why all patriotic workers and anti-fascists should take up anew, and resolutely organize common action—in every factory and plant, in every city and state, and on a national scale—to insure victory over fascism.

This is why labor should strengthen its ties and develop joint action for winning the war with the farmers, the Negro people, the youth, and with all other patriotic groups.

On this May Day, the American working class re-affirms its pledge of uninterrupted production and dedicates itself to the speeding up of the production of all war weapons with which our sons on the battlefield and our allies can smash the Hitler barbarians before the year is out. It resolves that the weapons it forges shall be put to immediate use to invade Europe. It resolves to provide additional weapons to crush Japanese fascist-militarism.

For this purpose, labor, which has already performed miracles in the battle of production, pledges itself to work for a centralized war economy, to help make the labor-management committees function, to encourage the wage incentive system under collective bargaining. It likewise pledges itself to organize the unorganized, to strengthen its unions with hundreds of thousands of women and Negro workers and to safeguard their rights and interests.

This May Day, too, American labor resolves to press more energetically to curb inflation and war profiteering. It demands that all parts of the President's seven-point economic stabilization program shall be adopted and enforced. It insists that Congress, the O.P.A. and the Office of Economic Stabilization shall stop appeasing the profiteers, shall really halt the rise in prices, rents and the cost of living. It demands that profits be curbed and that Congress enact a tax program based on ability to pay. It insists that sub-standard wages and wage inequalities shall be eliminated. It demands that the health, working efficiency and standards of the workers, the farmers, the youth, and the dependents of the soldiers shall be protected.

To further strengthen the national war effort, labor is especially determined to rout the appeaser forces in and outside of Congress. It is determined to defeat the reactionary anti-Administration coalition of the Tafts, Vandenbergs, Wheelers and Dieses. It is resolved to rally a majority of Congress behind the Commander-in-Chief. It is starting to weld a patriotic coalition of labor and farmers, Negro and white, of win-the-war Democrats and Repub-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

licans, of Communists and Farmer-Laborites. It is determined to extend labor's representation in the government and in all war agencies. *It is working for the removal of the obstructionists and defeatists from public office and all governmental bodies, and demands resolute measures to smash the fifth column.*

On May Day the working people also propose additional measures to strengthen national war morale and our nation's fighting strength. They insist: Protect the rights of labor. Abolish Jim-Crow in industry and the armed forces. Abolish the poll tax. Outlaw anti-Semitism. Put an end to discrimination against Communists and other anti-fascists in war industries, government agencies, and our armed forces.

Further, labor and the people demand: Reinforce the Four Freedoms. Free the anti-fascist prisoners in North Africa. Speed the national independence of India and its defense against Axis aggression. Hasten the national freedom of Puerto Rico. Free Prestes in Brazil and the imprisoned anti-fascists in Argentina.

These measures will strengthen national unity and our war effort. They are war measures advanced by the trade unions, the Communists, and other anti-fascists to accelerate a United Nations victory.

* * *

On this May Day, American labor, together with all patriots, hails the workers' state, the Soviet Union, land of socialism, country of free workers and peasants. It takes great pride in the epic struggles of the Red Army, in the mighty achievements of socialist industry and agriculture, in the fraternal unity of the liberated nations that live, work and battle unitedly in the U.S.S.R. On this traditional day of international solidarity, world labor and all progressive mankind salute the leader and genius of the heroic Red Army and Soviet people —Joseph Stalin.

On this May Day, American labor rededicates itself to forging unbreakable bonds of solidarity with the workers and the peoples of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, China and all our allies—*to establish that unity of joint military action which is indispensable for victory, for the complete surrender of the Axis, for the establishment of a just and enduring peace.*

The American people are strengthened in their resolve for victory by the knowledge that on this May Day our gallant soldiers, sailors and airmen in Africa and the Pacific, our heroic seamen in the merchant marine, and our heroic brothers in the Soviet, British and Chinese armies, as well as the brave partisans in Yugoslavia, Poland, France, and the other occupied countries, are striking fateful blows at the Axis enemy.

On this May Day, the working class, from Communists to conservatives, renews its pledge of support and loyalty to the Commander-in-Chief, President Roosevelt, pledging all its energy and devotion for the fulfillment of our nation's most immediate, most urgent need—the Second Front invasion of Europe.

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Workingmen and Workingwomen! Fellow Americans!

Make this May Day a day of united people's actions to carry through the military decisions of the Casablanca Conference, to step up war production, to ensure the total war mobilization of our nation!

Forward to a joint spring offensive of the armed forces of the U.S.A., the U.S.S.R. and Britain in a two front war against Hitler Germany in Europe!

Strengthen the friendship and fighting alliance of our country and its Soviet, British and Chinese Allies!

Forge the patriotic, anti-fascist unity of our nation in support of the win-the-war policies of our Commander-in-Chief!

Organize unity of action of the C.I.O., the A. F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods to enhance labor's patriotic role, consolidate national unity and speed victory!

Advance the unity of the anti-Hitler coalition by establishing joint action of the trade union movements of the Americas, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the workers of the world!

Consolidate hemispheric unity against the Axis and the anti-fascist unity of the governments and peoples of Latin and North America!

Everything to win the peoples' war of national liberation! Everything to smash Hitler and crush the Axis!

Open the Second Front now and put an end to Hitlerism in 1943!

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
WM. Z. FOSTER,
Chairman
EARL BROWDER,
General Secretary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTE OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT ON THE DECISION TO SUSPEND RELATIONS WITH THE POLISH GOVERNMENT

(Presented by People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs Vyacheslav Molotov to the Polish Ambassador on April 25.)

ON INSTRUCTIONS of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics I have the honor to bring to the attention of the Polish Government the following:

The Soviet Government considers the behavior of the Polish Government of late with regard to the U.S.S.R. entirely abnormal and violating all rules and standards in relations between two allied states.

The hostile slander campaign against the Soviet Union begun by the German fascists in connection with Polish officers killed by them in the district of Smolensk on territory occupied by German troops was immediately taken up by the Polish press. The Polish Government not only did not give a rebuff to the vile fascist slander against the U.S.S.R. but did not even deem it necessary to address any questions to the Soviet Government or to ask for explanations on this matter.

Having perpetrated a monstrous crime on the Polish officers, the Hitler authorities are playing an investigation comedy in the staging of which they utilized Polish pro-fascist elements recruited by them in occupied Poland where everything is under Hitler's heel and where an honest Pole cannot openly voice his opinion.

Into this "investigation" both the Polish Government and the Hitler Government invited the International Red Cross, which, in conditions of a terroristic regime, with its gallows and mass extermination of the civilian population, is compelled to take part in this investigation comedy whose director is Hitler.

It is understandable that such an "investigation," conducted, moreover, behind the back of the Soviet Government, cannot compel the trust of any honest people. The fact that the hostile campaign against the Soviet Union was begun simultaneously in the German and the Polish press and was conducted along the same lines leaves no doubt as to the existence of contact and complicity between Hitler, the enemy of the Allies, and the Polish Government with regard to the conduct of this hostile campaign.

At a time when the peoples of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Soviet Union are bleeding in hard struggle against Hitler Germany, straining every effort to defeat the common enemy of the Russian and Polish peoples and of all freedom-loving, democratic countries, the Polish Government, to please Hitler's tyranny, is striking a treacherous blow at the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government is aware that this hostile campaign against the Soviet Union has been undertaken by the Polish Government in order to utilize the Hitlerite piece of slanderous forgery for bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Government to wrest from it territorial concessions at the expense of the interests of the Soviet Ukraine, Soviet Byelorussia and Soviet Lithuania.

All these facts compel the Soviet Government to recognize that the present Government of Poland, having stooped to the path of complicity with the Hitler Government, has actually abrogated allied relations with the U.S.S.R. and has adopted a position of hostile relations to the Soviet Union.

On the basis of all this the Soviet Government has decided to suspend relations with the Polish Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HITLER'S POLISH PARTNERS*

THE foul concoctions of Goebbels and company regarding the "mass shooting of Polish officers by Soviet organs in 1940" were picked up, not only by Hitler's servile henchmen, but surprisingly enough also by the Ministry circles of General Sikorski.

It would seem that the Polish Ministry should have been well aware of the foul reputation of German propaganda, which has long since broken all records for monstrous, provocative lies. It would seem that the Polish Ministers should have realized the object of the Hitlerite frauds and provocations.

And nonetheless, contrary to common sense, the Polish Ministry did nothing other than to pick up the vile provocations of the Hitlerites and request the International Red Cross "to investigate" something non-existent—more correctly speaking, something that had been done by Hitler's executioners and afterwards fraudulently ascribed to Soviet organs.

The Polish leaders inexcusably fell for the bait of Goebbels' provocateurs and thus actually supported the trickery and slanderous inventions of the executioners of the Polish people. This being the case, there is no reason to be surprised at the fact that Hitler, too, asked the International Red Cross "to investigate" that which his criminals had staged. Thus the paths of the German provocateurs and their Polish accomplices have met. . . .

Meanwhile, the Polish ministry circles should know that it is not the first time that the Hitlerite liars are resorting to this method of influencing public opinion; that they are now acting in the very same way they tried to in Lvov in 1941 in connection with the so-called "victims of Bolshevik terror in Lvov." At that time the Soviet Information Bureau published a number of statements of the inhabitants of Lvov who escaped the bloody claws of the Hitlerites, witnesses who irrevocably proved that the Hitlerites were exterminating the population captured by the German fascist troops. Thousands of persons who witnessed the horrible fact of the mass executions of the peaceful population of Lvov by the Hitlerite murderers exposed the Nazi slanderers and heinous lie about about "Bolshevik atrocities in Lvov."

Summarizing the Lvov tragedy, the Soviet Information Bureau wrote on August 8, 1941:

"Hundreds of people, mainly officials of public organizations and trade unions and men and women Stakhanovites, were shot without

* Reprint of an editorial in *Pravda*, Moscow, April 19, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial or investigation. The German Storm Troopers ruthlessly bayoneted anyone who tried to protest against the inhuman treatment of the peaceful population by the Gestapo.

"Hundreds of victims of the fascist terror were brought from all parts of the city to one place, after which the inhabitants of Lvov, under threat of death, were rounded up to look at the corpses which the fascists announced to be the 'victims of Bolshevik terror.' German cameramen and photographers filmed the heaps of corpses and fabricated the frauds about 'Bolshevik atrocities.' "

A similar heinous Nazi provocation has been invented once again. The Germans captured former Polish war prisoners engaged on construction work in 1941 in the districts west of Smolensk and who, together with many Soviet people, inhabitants of the Smolensk region, fell into the hands of the German fascist executioners in the summer of 1941 after the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the Smolensk area.

The Germans brutally murdered the former Polish war prisoners and many Soviet people, and now they want to cover up the traces of their crimes; in the hope that there are credulous persons who will believe this, they are trying to hide their monstrous crimes by dishing up a new portion of abominable inventions.

The Hitlerite sadists, with an amazing knowledge of the matter, describe the "details" of the murder of the Polish officers. But the more they describe these "details," including even the visiting cards and passports which they themselves prudently inserted in the pockets of the savagely murdered officers, the clearer it becomes that the Hitlerite executioners, who have received their training in Himmler's torture chambers, are describing their own rich experience.

These foul inventions of the Hitlerite executioners pursue a definite object—to cover up the traces of their monstrous crimes, their own bloody misdeeds for which they will bear stern responsibility. Aware of the great wrath of the whole of progressive mankind at the atrocities against a defenseless and peaceful population, and particularly against the Jews, the Hitlerites are strenuously trying to incite gullible and naive persons against the Jews.

With this aim in view the Nazis invented some kind of non-existent Jewish "commissars" who allegedly took part in the murder of 10,000 Polish officers. These "commissars," Lev Rybak, Abraham Borisovich, Paul Brodninsky and Haim Fineberg, named by the German Information Bureau, never were in the "Smolensk Department of the G.P.U." or for that matter in the organs of the People's Commissariat of Home Affairs.

All these tales have been fabricated a little too crudely and clumsily to carry even a shadow of truth, and they are too monstrous to be given credence in any form or measure whatsoever.

In the light of these facts, the request of the Polish Ministry of National Defense to the International Red Cross cannot be esti-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mated as anything but direct and outright help to the Hitlerite provocateurs in concocting vile frauds.

Like other freedom-loving peoples, the Polish people will never forgive the German fascist hangmen their bloody crimes. The whole world knows what the Hitlerites have done to Poland, how they mutilated the Polish people, whom the Hitlerite executioners are systematically exterminating or driving into German slavery.

Polish courage, heroism and honor have won world-wide acclaim.

And these Poles who have willingly picked up the Hitlerite fraud, support it and are ready to collaborate with the Nazi hangmen of the Polish people will go down in history as the henchmen of the cannibal Hitler. The Polish nation will turn away from them as people who are helping Poland's mortal enemy—Hitler.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANTI-SOVIET CONSPIRACY IN THE UNITED STATES*

BY EARL BROWDER

I WISH to speak about the Ehrlich-Alter case in the United States.

This case originates in a conspiratorial effort of American citizens, organized on American soil, to overthrow the government of the Soviet Union, an Ally of the United States, at a moment when our own government has declared the defense of the Soviet Union is vital to the national interests of the United States. The government of the United States had pledged itself to the Soviet Union, in the agreement of December, 1933, that it would prevent the operation from United States soil of any organization directed toward the overthrow of the government of the Soviet Union. But the U. S. government has closed its eyes to this conspiracy, has tolerated its continued operations, and now permits a mass campaign in this country in defense of the conspiratorial agents who were apprehended and executed in the Soviet Union.

We do not know the evidence upon which a Soviet Court condemned Ehrlich and Alter. But we have enough evidence of the conspiracy in the United States, of which Ehrlich and Alter were agents, to confirm the findings of the Soviet court.

If Ehrlich and Alter were true to the teachings and decisions of those men in the United States who are their sponsors, then we know that they were as guilty as Benedict Arnold. And their American sponsors testify publicly that their agents were true to them.

A chief leader of the anti-Soviet conspiracy in the United States is a certain Mr. N. Chanin. This gentleman operates as a leader of the so-called "Jewish Labor Committee." For years he has collected money in this country to be used for secret conspiratorial work inside the Soviet Union. What was the nature of that secret work? Mr. Chanin has himself described it, writing in the magazine *Friend*, issue of January, 1942:

"The last shot was not yet fired. It will still be fired. And the last shot will be fired from free America—and from that shot the Stalin regime, too, will be shot to pieces."

Mr. Chanin was expressing the political line of the Social-Democratic Federation of the United

* Speech delivered at a Communist Party rally, Brooklyn, N. Y., April 1, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States. This line was publicly expressed in a detailed thesis, published under date of July 1, 1941, in a pamphlet entitled *War Aims, Peace Terms, and the World After the War,* by the Rand School Press. It is signed by leading members of the Social-Democratic organizations of emigré Germans, Austrians, and Russians, as well as by the Americans, all long associated with every effort to overthrow the Soviet Government. The central thought of this declaration is the destruction of the Soviet Union. It calls for the destruction of the Soviet Government in the course of the war; in case that government "should survive the war," it demands preparations for removing this "source of danger" by the "armed force" of Britain and America; it links the Soviet Union with Nazi Germany as equally "totalitarian regimes"; it declares for a new League of Nations to which Russia shall be admitted "once she has been freed from totalitarian rule."

This group of American conspirators, with their allies from the emigration, appointed as their representatives in the Soviet Union Messrs. Ehrlich and Alter, and heavily financed them through the channels of the Polish government-in-exile, which are most extremely anti-Soviet and anti-Semitic. These agents, Ehrlich and Alter, were informed that "the Stalin regime, too, will be shot to pieces," and that the "last shot will be fired from free America."

Evidently Ehrlich and Alter took the teachings and decisions of their paymasters in New York at their face value, and tried to put them into action.

But everyone who goes into the Soviet Union for the purpose of destroying the Soviet Government is in grave danger of being himself destroyed. That is what happened to Ehrlich and Alter, in company with a few million Nazis and their Rumanian, Finnish, Hungarian, Italian, and Spanish vassals.

The Government of the United States has declared that America's national interests also lie in preserving the Soviet Government from all current attempts to destroy it. Our country is devoting a few billion dollars in lend-lease materials to carry out that declaration, we signed the Pact of the United Nations, we pledged to open the Second Front.

But Mr. Chanin, together with Mr. Dubinsky, Mr. Abe Cahan, and others of Russian origin who think they should rule the Soviet peoples from afar, from New York, raise a great howl about the loss of their two agents inside the Soviet Union. They organize "protest meetings," denounce the Soviet Government in the most unmeasured and slanderous terms, and even inveigle a few misguided governmental figures to lend their names to this outrageous campaign.

It would be well to recall that these same gentlemen put up a protest even more unconditional in defense of Mr. Leon Trotsky. They were the defenders of Zinoviev, Bukharin, Tukhachevsky, and the rest of the "fifth column" in the Soviet Union, whose execution deprived Hitler of his Quislings. Now

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they defend Ehrlich and Alter in the same terms, though without the same energy and confidence.

And how do they "defend" their two agents? Do they say that Ehrlich and Alter in the Soviet Union were actually helping the Red Army win their glorious triumphs which saved world civilization from destruction? They do not dare make such a claim, for it would fly in the face of all their own declarations.

Do they claim that the Soviet Union is not intelligent enough to know its friends from its enemies, and that it executed the wrong men? They do not dare make such a claim, for they themselves are not friends but enemies of the Soviet Union.

What they really say, boiled down to its essence, is to claim for their agents in the Soviet Union the status of "extra-territorial rights" accorded to ambassadors, together with the right, not accorded to any one, even ambassadors, of organizing to overthrow the government of the Soviet Union in the midst of life-and-death war.

Senator Mead loaned his name to the Chanin-Dubinsky-Cahan conspiracy in connection with a public meeting last Friday. Mayor La Guardia did the same. Several labor leaders also allowed themselves to be smeared with the mud of this political underworld. Of course, none of these men knows Ehrlich and Alter as anything but names. None of them has been told that Ehrlich and Alter were working in the Soviet Union to prepare "the last shot"—to come from America—by which the "Stalin regime" was to be "shot to pieces." None of them speaks for the American trade unions in expressing hostility to the Soviet Union.

It is not my role to speak here in defense of the Soviet Union. Our great Ally needs no defense from me. I speak in defense of my own country, the United States, which is more endangered by this miserable conspiracy hatched on its soil than is the Soviet Union. For it is a conspiracy against the United Nations, against victory itself.

Let me ask Senator Mead, Mayor La Guardia, and those responsible labor leaders who fell into the anti-Soviet net of conspiracy, to turn for inspiration rather to Thomas Jefferson. If they have no personal knowledge of Ehrlich and Alter, and they have not, they could at least have maintained the position Jefferson took when he faced the conspiracy of Aaron Burr, the traitor who had even more respectable friends than Ehrlich and Alter. Jefferson told us how to handle such conspirators in the following immortal words:

"I did wish to see these people get what they deserved; and under the maxim of the law itself, that *inter arma silent leges*, that in an encampment expecting daily attack from a powerful enemy, self-preservation is paramount to all law, I expected that instead of invoking the forms of Law to cover traitors, all good citizens would have concurred in securing them. Should we have ever gained our Revolution, if we had bound our hands by manacles of the law, not only in the beginning, but in any part of the revolu-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary conflict?" (*Writings*, Vol. XII, p. 183.)

In the case of Ehrlich and Alter, there is no reason to deplore their execution, except upon the part of those who share their aim to destroy the Soviet Union and its socialist system.

The whole democratic world has reason to rejoice that the socialist state has always had the courage to strike hard and accurately and ruthlessly at its counter-revolutionary conspirators.

But there is reason to deplore the rise of anti-Soviet agitation in the United States. This agitation comes at a moment when the whole war is at a turning point. The Nazi armies are being whittled down, pushed back, and prepared for the final blow of destruction, by the amazing heroism and fighting capacity of the Red Army and the genius of its leadership headed by Salin. Herr Goebbels made his frantic appeal to the "gentlemen of the West" who understand "the menace of Bolshevism." The *New York Times* and William C. Bullitt have launched their campaign for the "carrot and club" method of dealing with the Soviet Union, and openly threaten to carry America to the side of Hitler. The hullabaloo about Ehrlich and Alter is a part of this response of the appeasers and defeatists to delay the Second Front and to prepare the ground for negotiations with Hitler. It is a part of the preparations for what Vice President Wallace warned against as a "double-cross" of the Soviet Union.

The people and government of the United States, however, have learned the lesson that the Soviet Union is not our enemy, as the anti-Soviet agitators try to make it appear, but on the contrary the great country of socialism is our natural ally, and all the stronger our ally because it is a socialist country.

The people of the United States do not want any "protests" to our great Soviet Ally, but they want expressions of deep friendship and appreciation for the immeasurable benefits the Soviet Union has conferred upon us by cracking the Nazi armies, and saving the world from Hitler domination.

The people of the United States want to have nothing to do with any one who conspires to overthrow the Soviet Government; on the contrary they want a long-term treaty of alliance and friendship between the Soviet Government and our own, they want a real coalition war.

For this, however, it is necessary to clean out the Ehrlich-Alter conspiracy from American soil. For this conspiracy is directed toward breaking the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

The future of our country, and of the world, is at stake.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FORGE WORLD LABOR UNITY!

BY ROY HUDSON

THE American trade union movement has come a long way since May First, 1889. Then organized labor initiated a national struggle for the eight-hour day and launched a national campaign to organize the workers behind this and other demands. To strengthen its fight for the eight-hour day and to establish a powerful trade union movement, American labor urged that the workers of the world join with them in the struggle. It proposed that on May First trade unionists in all countries demonstrate their solidarity and unity behind the fighting slogan launched by the trade union movement of America.

At that time the eight-hour day was something to fight for, and the right of the workers to organize and the ability of the trade unions to organize them had still to be established. Now, in most industries the eight-hour day has become an established fact, collective bargaining has become the rule and not the exception. Today there are over twelve million workers organized. Today American labor is exerting great political influence, is becoming a stronger *independent political force,* is playing a vital and indispensable role in our national war effort.

Never in its history has the American trade union movement been stronger. Today it is the second largest trade union movement in the world and the most powerful organized group of workers in any capitalist country. Even though a united labor movement still must be achieved, American labor, on this May Day, may well be proud of the manner in which it has kept the faith with those who founded the American trade union movement.

But, whatever its strength, whatever its achievements, the fact remains that on this May Day the trade union movement needs to marshal all its forces to fight for the very existence of the trade unions. The organized strength of the workers was never greater; but never have the enemies of labor been more determined to destroy trade unionism along with every vestige of democracy and the independence of nations. The main enemies of the trade unions today are those forces which destroyed unionism in France, Germany, Italy and the conquered countries of Europe. The destruction of trade unions in those nations enslaved by Hitler can leave no doubt what would happen to the C.I.O., A. F. of L. and the Railroad

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brotherhoods in the event Hitler and his allies were victorious.

Therefore labor is giving its all and is prepared to make even greater efforts and sacrifices for our nation's independence and to guarantee victory in the war. In so doing, labor is doing its share to uphold those democratic rights established and guaranteed to all Americans by the founders of our nation. It is also defending those democratic laws and institutions and social gains won by labor with the support of the democratic masses, which respect the rights of the workers to organize, to bargain collectively, to secure the passage of social legislation necessary to the well-being of the workers, and make their voice heard in the affairs of the nation, not only to guarantee victory, but to achieve a better world.

Thus on May Day, 1943, organized labor must recognize squarely that the fight for a free America is also a fight for a free trade union movement, that in fighting to defend America trade unionists are also fighting to defend and maintain their unions. As trade unionists they are fighting to maintain those rights shared by all Americans, and they are also fighting to maintain trade unions established by the exercise of these rights.

Thus, the task before the trade union movement on this May Day is that task that units all patriotic Americans together with the peoples of all countries—to win victory over fascism, and to win it speedily by ensuring real coalition warfare, an Anglo-American invasion of Europe this spring.

* * *

Never, since that May Day when the world labor movement, at the initiative of the American trade unions, demonstrated their unity behind the common demand of the eight-hour day, has world labor taken such a common stand behind a single common demand. Victory over fascism is the central fighting demand shared by every free trade union throughout the world.

The goal is agreed upon—but unity of labor on a world scale as well as unity of American labor to achieve that goal still has to be won. This lack of unity cannot but weaken the cause of all labor and the people in the war against fascism. The initial steps in establishing the basis for international labor solidarity have already been taken by the formation of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. But the American trade union movement still remains, on the whole, isolated and separated from its fellow trade unionists in other lands. In failing to throw its great weight behind the Anglo-Soviet Committee, American labor has also discouraged the labor movements of other nations from taking prompt action to cement world solidarity to win the war. Furthermore, this absence of world labor unity, for which American labor must accept grave responsibilities, has played into the hands of those who seek to undermine the unity of the United States with Britain, the Soviet Union and the rest of the United Nations and to disrupt the unity of the American people behind our Commander-in-Chief.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The cause of victory over Hitler's Axis is endangered by the lack of international labor unity. On this May Day American labor has the solemn duty to the peoples of the United States, to our Allies, to the enslaved peoples of Europe, to pledge that it will leave no stone unturned until the representatives of the American trade union movement take their rightful place beside the organized workers of other lands united with them in the joint struggle for the defeat of Hitler and the fascist Axis, for the independence of all nations, for the freedom of all peoples, and for the cause of labor throughout the world.

United struggle in support of the common demand — the eight-hour day—was the manner in which American labor approached the question of international unity in 1889. The idea that inspired labor at that time—that the demands of the workers could be won only through the organized strength and struggle of the world working class —remains true today. Today American labor can begin to fulfill its responsibilities, first of all, by demonstrating its united active support for every measure necessary for the invasion of Europe. The Second Front is that common action necessary to achieve the goal of labor and all the people—the military destruction of fascism.

Today, the workers in France, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Yugoslavia, and other countries, fighting to overthrow Hitler, to restore the independence of their nations, and to re-establish their trade unions—as well as the organized workers in Britain and Soviet Russia — will judge the war effort and the stand of American labor on international labor unity primarily by the manner in which American labor conducts an active, organized struggle for the invasion of Europe and for carrying forward the offensive against Hitlerism on all fronts.

Labor in America must face the grim fact that if there was no Second Front in 1942—if the decisions of the Casablanca Conference have not yet been executed—if the enemies of these decisions have been able to force a discussion as to whether these should be reconsidered, it is in no great part due to the fact that while labor supports wholeheartedly the policy for the offensive and coalition warfare, it has not yet actively organized to fight to realize this policy.

United and determined struggle upon the part of labor will arouse and mobilize the entire people, isolate the defeatists, combat and counteract those who delay the Second Front in their desire to weaken our Allies in order to advance their selfish interests by attempting to secure American domination in world affairs. Labor must realize that there are some in America who still think they can live in the same world with Hitler. There are some who greedily seek to win the war in such a manner as to serve their special interests at the expense of our Allies and still fail to see that any attempt to do so endangers victory and sacrifices the interests of America. And these forces must be combated and defeated.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American trade unionists know that they cannot live in the same world with fascism and that the cause and interests of American labor are served only if all nations are free and the rights of the workers are respected everywhere. Therefore, as that class which is an uncompromising foe of fascism and the staunchest defender of democracy and the rights of all the people, labor must develop the greatest initiative in the struggle against the defeatists and all those forces who hamper our patriotic and just war, who try to disrupt our alliance with the Soviet Union, Britain, China and the other United Nations.

Thus, by energetically fighting for the speedy opening of the Second Front in Europe, American labor will advance the cause of victory, strengthen its ties with the labor movement in other countries, and weaken and isolate those who are opposed to world labor unity.

* * *

Philip Murray recently made a statement of profound significance when he said: "If we are United Nations in fact, we must be so in practice—not only in the relations between governments but in the relations between the trade unions of the United Nations." One might add —there can be no United Nations in fact unless it is confirmed in practice by labor and the people.

The most effective fight for the program of the United Nations and against its enemies cannot be developed if at the same time American labor remains separated from the trade unions of other nations. For the trade unions of America to join hands with other labor movements is an act of confirming and guaranteeing that the pledge of the Government of the United States to cooperate with our Allies in waging war for the unconditional surrender of the Axis and the solution of postwar problems will be fulfilled by the people. The failure to take this step cannot but mean that the enemies of victory are still in a powerful position to wage their struggle against the policies of the United Nations and that labor and the people have not yet learned how to fight effectively for implementing the policies of their government and to influence its course.

If the expressed desire of the majority of the American workers for international unity has been thwarted, it is because only a section of labor fully appreciates the urgency of labor solidarity to win the war and the fact that there can be no international labor cooperation if the trade unions of the Soviet Union are excluded.

The Hutchesons, Wolls and Dubinskys have opposed participation of the A. F. of L. in the Anglo-Soviet Committee on the Goebbels-inspired pretense and slander that the trade unions of the Soviet Union are not free. Philip Murray gave a fitting answer to this slanderous proposition when he declared:

"The C.I.O. doesn't see any validity to the objections of the A. F. of L. to collaboration with the unions of the Soviet Union and has said so publicly."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Wolls, Hutchesons, Lewises and Dubinskys can be defeated only when all labor meets this issue as squarely as have Murray and the C.I.O. American labor must face the fact that it has already paid dearly by its failure actively to take up the cudgels against those who oppose international labor cooperation. It can no longer afford to remain silent and passive when the fate of the United States and the world and the very existence of the labor movement are at stake, jeopardized by the policies of those who long ago lost the confidence of the great majority of the workers.

There can be no doubt that the position of the A. F. of L. Executive Council is in conflict with the sentiment of the A. F. of L. membership, which has an undying hatred of fascism and of those un-American forces in our country who would conclude a negotiated peace with Hitler, Mussolini and the Mikado. But failure of the A. F. of L. to cooperate with the unions of the Soviet Union plays into the hands of those who fight against collaboration by the government and people of the United States with the government and peoples of the Soviet Union. Labor cannot effectively fight against these dangerous forces and at the same time tolerate the present position of the A. F. of L. Executive Council, because this means acceptance of the basic propositions of Hitler and the defeatists that the Soviet Union is a "menace" to the existence of other nations and that collaboration is impossible between nations with different types of economic systems. Upholding the position of the A. F. of L. Executive Council or remaining passive or silent in the face of it, as have many Left and progressive win-the-war forces, results in confusing issues instead of defining them, enables the defeatists to hide their position, weakens the struggle against the fifth column, and helps those who seek to promote disunity in the ranks of the labor movement, in the nation, and among the United Nations.

Likewise, certain leaders of the British unions, like Sir Walter Citrine, do not serve the interests of international solidarity, to which the British Trade Union Congress is committed, when they capitulate to the anti-C.I.O., anti-Soviet line of Hutcheson, Woll & Company.

Most of those forces who still have blind prejudices against Communism recognize that the weakening of the Soviet Union or its destruction would be fatal to the cause of victory. Yet some of these forces are being used for this purpose when they fall into the trap set by those who slanderously charge that "there are no free unions in the Soviet Union." It has already made some of them participants in the anti-Soviet incitements organized by anti-Soviet Social-Democrats in connection with the Alter-Ehrlich case. Such labor leaders as Thomas Lyons, William Green, or even such men as Harvey Brown, should ask themselves whether they share the same program as Raphael Abramowitch and others whose professed program is to "free" Russian labor by overthrowing the Soviet Union. It is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

difficult to believe that such men support this Hitlerite anti-Soviet policy. That is why they should face the fact that in lending their names to the so-called Conference on International Labor Affairs they are in danger of becoming the dupes of those who, in violation of the policy of the United States and against its national interests, conspire to bring about the downfall of the government of our Ally, the Soviet Union.

That is the logic of the situation, these are the conclusions drawn by the enemies of international labor unity—and all the win-the-war forces, whatever their views on the communist form of society, should recognize that victory in the war requires the firmest possible unity between the United States and the Soviet Union and that the enemies of the policy of coalition war and the United Nations seek to defeat these policies with the aid of the Goebbels slogan: International labor unity must exclude the unions of the Soviet Union.

Failure to take a stand on the fundamental question of collaboration with the unions of the Soviet Union not only retards international labor unity by surrendering to the position of Woll and Hutcheson, but it also enables these anti-unity, anti-Roosevelt and anti-Soviet forces to prevent the win-the-war forces from uniting to oppose them on all other decisive questions. Hutcheson, Woll and Company can be isolated, their stranglehold on the Executive Council broken, their conspiracy with Lewis smashed, only if the win-the-war forces who oppose them on the question of support of the Roosevelt Administration and its victory policies, who oppose them on the question of unity with the C.I.O., break with their reactionary and defeatist opposition to international labor unity.

The Soviet Union, the first socialist state, founded by the Russian working class which rallied around it all the democratic peoples of Russia, is acknowledged by all countries fighting for their freedom as the bulwark of this global war against fascism. The contribution of this great state, founded by a section of the world working class, emphasizes the role played by the working class of every country in the common struggle of all humanity. Whatever a trade unionist might think about communism, he cannot but recognize that the Soviet Union expresses the will and achievement of the Russian workers and that their contribution to the war effort is a part of the contribution of the world working class to the common struggle of all people. He cannot but feel that the decisive contributions of the Soviet Union to the war effort have enhanced the standing and prestige of the workers and organized labor in the eyes of the people in every country. He can truly feel that the contributions of the Soviet Union are part of the contributions of his class and therefore have greater pride and confidence in the class of which he is a member. Above everything else he cannot but recognize that unity of American labor with the trade unions of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union, representing the most powerful and decisive sections of the world labor movement, increases the strength of the American and world trade union movement and its ability to help guarantee victory over the Hitler Axis, maintain the independence of every nation, secure freedom for all peoples, and insure the existence and strengthening of the organized labor movement of the world.

* * *

The Wolls, Hutchesons, the Dubinskys and Lewises have succeeded in blocking labor unity; but they have not succeeded in holding back the fight for world labor cooperation and in preventing it from gaining strength. The C.I.O. and the Railroad Brotherhoods have rejected the anti-Soviet position of these gentlemen and have taken a firm stand for international unity. And one can say that the reactionary clique in the Executive Council has been able to dictate its policies mainly by default of the progressives in the A. F. of L. on this issue. The blows struck against the position of the Executive Council and for international cooperation by a large number of central labor bodies, state federations, a few international unions, as well as the work of the New York committee, all show that where the issue is joined and leadership given the membership of the A. F. of L. takes a stand for grasping the hand of the trade unionists in the Soviet Union and every other land.

Today it is both possible and necessary to carry forward and strengthen the fight for international unity. If those sections of the labor movement that have already registered a firm stand, especially the C.I.O. and Railroad Brotherhoods, take such immediate steps as are practical to establish direct contact with the unions of Britain and the Soviet Union, it will further strengthen the struggle against the Hutchesons and Wolls. In this respect the decision of the automobile, electrical, and maritime unions of the C.I.O. to send delegations to these two great nations and directly exchange greetings and experiences with the trade unions of Britain and the Soviet Union is of great significance. For it shows that one of the objective of the Hutchesons and Wolls, which is to prevent any kind of contact from being established by the American unions, whether C.I.O. or A. F. of L., with the trade unions of other countries, and especially with the Soviet Union, is now being counteracted.

These steps, together with the decisions of the C.T.M. of Mexico to seek affiliation with the Anglo-Soviet Committee, and its recommendation for a Hemispheric Conference of Unions to consider similar steps, are all indications that the struggle for international labor unity on this May Day can enter a higher stage in which it is possible to strengthen and speed up the whole struggle.

But this requires, above everything else, action upon the part of the membership of the A. F. of L. Let every local union speak out for affiliation to the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee and through the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

central bodies, state conventions and international unions of the A. F. of L.; let the true voice of the membership be heard. And more than resolutions are possible and necessary. The establishment of direct contact with corresponding unions in Britain and the Soviet Union, as well as the exchange of experiences through regular correspondence are of great importance. Likewise, direct action by international unions of the A. F. of L. to break down the barriers erected by the Executive Council, by following the example set by some of the C.I.O. unions, could be a death-blow to the Hutchesons and Wolls.

The efforts of American labor to secure the speedy invasion of Europe by Britain and the United States, to increase production, to back up the hand of President Roosevelt, isolating the defeatists, strengthening national unity, and cementing our nation's alliance with the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the other United Nations, can all be reinforced and strengthened through the fulfillment of the responsibilities of the American trade union movement in the struggle for the unity of the world trade union movement in support of the people's war against fascism and for the independence of all nations and the freedom of all peoples.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MARXISM, PRUSSIANISM, AND MR. WALLACE

BY V. J. JEROME

I

WITH the great Soviet offensive of the past winter the war of the United Nations advanced to a new stage. The fascist invader was hurled back—beyond the starting point of his 1942 offensive. One hundred and eighty-five thousand square miles of Soviet territory were liberated. Over a million Nazi troops were killed or captured, and mountainous stocks of armaments seized or destroyed. From Velikie Luki to Rostov, major strong-points were reconquered. The Leningrad siege was raised. The Nazis were expelled from the greatest part of the Caucasus. The Rzhev-Vyazma salient was cleared. And in the most stupendous defeat in the history of wars Hitler's entire Sixth Army was destroyed at Stalingrad. These mighty feats of victory on the Eastern Front blazed before the eyes of the peoples of the United Nations, opening, as never since the outbreak of the war, vistas to victory.

A tremendous resurgence of guerrilla warfare now marked the struggle of the Axis-yoked peoples of Europe. The subjugated nations evidenced their restiveness—leading, for example, the conservative French ex-Deputy C. J. Fernand-Laurent to say, three months after his escape from France, "If there is an Allied landing [in France] within the next month or two, it will be aided by a powerful uprising."* The rout of Rommel's army in Egypt and the Allied offensive operations in North Africa, the signal victories over the Japanese in Midway, the Coral Sea, the Solomons, and New Guinea; the mass air assaults upon Germany and Italy—all these actions indicated that the tide of the war had turned in favor of the United Nations; that the Soviet victories had, in Stalin's words, "laid a firm foundation for victory over the German fascist armies." The strategic means of realizing this advantage was the launching of the Anglo-American invasion of Europe: the conditions for the Second Front were now more evidently favorable than ever before.

Thus, the Casablanca Conference called for "unconditional surrender." The United States and Britain pledged to extend the secondary offensive operations in North Africa to the decisive European theatre of the war.

In this situation, Nazism resumed its "peace" offensive, offering itself

* From an address at the Overseas Press Club, New York, March 24, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again as a club against Bolshevism —as the guarantor of Europe's destiny! The Nazi chieftains pleaded with the "gentlemen" (as Goering put it) in England and the United States to return to the policy of Munich.

Of course, their aim was to have their "peace" plea caught up by their friends abroad.

The pro-fascists and defeatists in the United States collaborated well with the Berlin demagogues—to disrupt national unity, block the Western Front, undermine the coalition of the United Nations, and prepare a "negotiated peace" to avoid defeat of the Axis. They performed the English version of the Berlin "help-us-save-Europe" routine: they vociferated about the bugbear of Communism; they demanded to know the Soviet "intentions"; they professed fear for the fate of Europe if the Red Army should be victorious; they attempted to pervert the Atlantic Charter into an instrument for dismembering the Soviet Union and foisting reactionary governments on the peoples of the Baltic, Byelorussian, Western Ukrainian, and Moldavian Soviet Republics; they built up prospects of post-war antagonisms between the United States and the U.S.S.R.; in fine, they sought new means (where once their lamentable protégé Mannerheim-Finland had served) for creating a new coalition against the Soviet Union.

Thus, the notorious editorial in the defeatist *New York Daily News* of February 6, in commenting on our big-army plans, hopefully speculated that a large army would enable the Anglo-American participants at the peace table "to talk tougher to Russia." Thus, that expert at Munichism and anti-Soviet intrigue, William C. Bullitt, warned America of the "danger" that after Hitler-Germany has been smashed, "the real club will be in the hands of Stalin." Thus, "negotiated-peace" plotter Herbert Hoover launched his campaign against opening the Second Front in 1943: a new and pointed extension of his proposal to "feed the children of Europe"—in effect, a proposal to fill the granaries of Hitler!

The Berlin "peace" offensive was facilitated by the irresponsible and provocative assertions of Ambassador Standley in regard to our Soviet ally.

And the same Berlin "peace" offensive was echoed in the attempt by a disruptive Social-Democratic clique to foment an Alter-Ehrlich anti-Soviet hysteria.

Among the loudest in the anti-Soviet chorus has been the familiar voice of the fascist-minded Polish gentry, including their representatives in the emigré government. At the very moment when the Red Army was most rapidly driving westward and threatening to clear Poland of the fascist occupation forces, certain Polish emigré circles chose to speculate on Poland's post-war "eastern boundaries." In this, the Polish fascistic element derived aid from Premier Wladislaw Sikorski's provocative and pro-Hitler voicing of certain "disagreements" with the Soviet Government on the part of the Polish government-in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exile.* Polish emigré publications in England have brought forth a flood of imperialistic sentiments and incitations against the Soviet Union, resurrecting the old annexationist cries of the Colonel Becks and the Marshal Pilsudskis. Thus, the Polish journal *Utro Polske* (London) would have it that "Poland is situated between two aggressive states."

To such whinings the noted Soviet Ukrainian dramatist, Alxender Korneichuk, gave the lie recently in answering one such Polish reactionary:

"He is waiting in London for the Red Army to smash the Germans, and then he will return from England with 'the right of struggle' against the Soviet Ukraine, against the Soviet Ukrainian people."

In recognition of the insidious effect of Nazi propaganda on certain influential American spheres the noted foreign correspondent William Shirer wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* on March 28:

"It is a melancholy comment on the success of [Nazi] propaganda to see intelligent circles in this country subscribing to the thesis that the Atlantic Charter must be raised to oppose Russia's legitimate concern over her western frontiers—a concern no less legitimate and no more opposed to the Charter than our own preoccupation over the security of our American frontiers."

Not only defeatists and pro-fascists—even some circles basically interested in winning the war, but weakened by anti-Soviet prejudices, were thrown into a state of destructive confusion by the Nazi "peace" barrage. Such vacillating elements are influenced toward arguments and meneuvers that render them at times indistinguishable from the defeatists.

Thus, the *New York Times* has intermittently confounded its position through involvement in the current drive against American-Soviet friendship and coalition warfare. It has at times lent support to the imperialistic designs to pervert the Atlantic Charter, which affirms the rights of nations to self-determination, into a premise for the creation of a new *cordon sanitaire* of anti-Soviet buffer states; it has brazenly impugned the motives of our Soviet ally ("The European nations did not go to war against Hitler to submit to Russian domination"*) and it has brought forward one specious argument after another designed to block Allied global strategy and the opening of the Second Front.

Unfortunately, the Administration has not yet fully and actively implemented its fundamentally correct war program with consistent policies. Instead of waging war on all defeatists and obstructionists, it has frequently shown a tendency to appease the appeasers. Basically, of course, the Administration adheres to the position established in the U.S.A. - U.S.S.R. War-Aid Agreement of June 11, 1942, and fortified by the Casablanca decision for invading Europe this year. President Roosevelt in his 1943 Message to

* This article was written prior to the report of the Soviet Union's severance of diplomatic relations with the Polish Government.—*Ed.*

* March 21, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congress re-emphasized that unity with our Allied leaders "is effective in planning and carrying out the major strategy of this war and in building up and maintaining the lines of supplies." Yet the Administration tolerates men in strategic posts in our State Department and our diplomatic service, and in certain other agencies including the War Department, who have proved themselves hostile to Allied unity, in particular to the American-Soviet Alliance; men who are undermining the "cooperative undertaking" pledged in the June 11 Agreement.

What but madness can make for the toleration in high places of advocates of a *cordon sanitaire* against our Soviet ally? What, indeed, can permit the fostering of Hitlerian anti-Sovietism in our foreign policy but the "sheer madness" to which *The Times* of London pointed in its famous editorial of March 10:

"To suppose that Britain and the United States, with the aid of some lesser European powers, could maintain permanent security in Europe through a policy which alienated Russia and induced her to disinterest herself in continental affairs would be sheer madness."

It is high time that our Chief Executive rid the State Department of policies and personnel that have given our country's support, in a war against fascism, to Vichy, to Franco, Mannerheim, Darlan, Peyrouton, Mikhailovich, Otto of Hapsburg, Tibor Eckhardt of Hungary, and to Baltic "emissaries."

It is high time that we clear the decks of our ship of state of Munichite mutineers—the Berles, Bullitts, and Robert Murphys. It is high time that in America, too, the Margessons and Moore-Brabazons be forced out of public office by an embattled people's will.

II

It is disturbing in this situation, when our President has issued the slogan of "Unconditional Surrender," that even so outstanding a proponent of United Nations solidarity and advocate of long-range friendly relations with the Soviet Union as Vice-President Wallace has yielded important territory to the Munichites.

In his speech of March 8, Wallace stressed understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States as an essential condition of future peace on a world scale. Thereby he strongly enhanced the service he has continuously rendered to the cause of the United Nations. Yet the speech contained statements out of accord with that service: statements which can be put to the purposes of disunity by the reactionary forces in America.

In that speech Wallace said of Marxism:

"This philosophy in some ways is the child of Prussianism, because Marx, its high priest, was molded in his thinking by Hegel, the great philosopher of the Prussian State.

"Marxianism has used the Cheka, just as Prussianism has used the Gestapo. . . ."*

What dark hints could be read into this statement! How easily this

* In a speech at Delaware, Ohio, March 8, 1943.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might be taken as text for further diatribes by the un-American Dies Committee, of whose chairman Wallace has declared: "The effect on our morale would be less damaging if Mr. Dies were on the Hitler payroll."

For refutation of this view of Marxism, we need only quote another passage of Wallace's speech:

"The ancestors of many of the people of German origin in the United States were members of the minority in Germany who dissented from the extremist tendencies toward militarism. Thousands of these dissenters migrated to this country in the twenty or thirty years after the failure of the revolution of 1848. Their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren today are among our finest American citizens."

In this minority of dissenters, the voice of Karl Marx was clearest and boldest in denunciation of the Prussian State and all its evils. It was in America, not Prussia, that the publication of Marx's classic historical work, *The Eighteenth Brumaire*, was first made possible! It was the *New York Daily Tribune*, not a Berlin gazette, that after the defeat of the 1848 Revolution allowed Marx to write his commentaries on European events.

The anti-Prussianist disciples of Karl Marx in the United States, working in closest harmony with other 'Forty-eighters, exerted a strong influence in organizing the decisive German-American vote for the history-molding nomination of Lincoln. Outstanding associates of Marx in the United States won high distinction in service in the Civil War, among whom August Willich and Joseph Weydemeyer were commissioned by Lincoln as generals of the Union Army.

The devotion of those early Communists in America to the cause of Union victory was one with the consistent support that Marx, Engels, and the working class movement they led in Europe rendered to the war for Negro emancipation and the maintenance of the Union.

President Lincoln acknowledged that truth in his message to the First International, in which he said:

"The United States . . . derive new encouragement to persevere from the testimony of the workingmen of Europe that the national attitude is favored with their enlightened approval and earnest sympathies."

Marxism, far from being "the child of Prussianism," is an international development, world-wide in its originations as it is world-embracing in its scope. British political economy, French Socialist thought, and classical German philosophy were the main international tributaries of Marxism, constituting, as Lenin said, "the three chief ideological currents of the Nineteenth Century, represented respectively by the three most advanced countries of humanity."

Marxism embodies in scientific form the universal aspirations and struggles of the oppressed since man first enslaved man. It is the programmatic synthesis of the strivings throughout the ages for a world without classes, without hunger, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without wars. It is the historical confluence of the freedom-theme that led the Spartacist slaves of Rome in heroic battle, the social protest of the Hebrew herdsman-prophet Amos, the earthly meaning in the Kingdom of Heaven of the primitive Christian-communists, the equality-ideal for which the Taborite brotherhood of Bohemia warred, the communist ardor of the German peasant-war leader Thomas Münzer, the Spirit of '76 and the Jeffersonian Bill of Rights, the English Chartist banner of the first organized workers' movement, the surge of the Jacobin democratic revolution and the barricades of the Parisian proletarians in '48 and '71.

Marxism is international, arising out of the conditions of the capitalist mode of production, out of the struggles of the working class, whose theory and program it constitutes. This truth is significantly reflected for us Americans in Engels' statements regarding the great anthropologist Lewis Henry Morgan:

". . . in America, in his own way, Morgan had indeed rediscovered the materialist conception of history that was discovered by Marx."

"[Morgan spoke] of a future transformation of society in words which Karl Marx might have used."*

And what can be more plain-speaking proof of the world paternity of Marxism than the charge itself, "Communism is a foreign importation," which has been leveled in every language of the world?

The persecution of the Marxists is as old as Marxism. Marx, Engels, and many of their followers were arrested in Prussia for participation in the 1848 Revolution; Prussian authorities harassed their publications and intercepted their correspondence. Marx was expelled from France upon the request of the Prussian Government; he was expelled from Belgium. Engels, likewise, was deported from France and from Belgium. Marxian adherents were exiled from Prussia and Austria. They were harried by Prussian police in France, Belgium, and Switzerland. Today, the terror of Hitler - Prussianism against the Communists of Germany and the occupied countries, and the horror of its atrocities, in its war for world domination and enslavement, against the people of the Marxist Soviet State have no parallel in the cruelties of Torquemada, in the carnage of Attila and Genghis Khan.

III

The theoretical and historical points we have discussed are in no sense academic. They are essential in correcting those ignorant prejudices and false assumptions regarding Marxism and our Soviet ally which, unfortunately, are bolstered by current statements such as those cited from Wallace's speech. Coming, especially, from a statesman who is one of the closest collaborators of President Roosevelt and is acknowledged by the masses of the entire hemisphere as speaking for the most liberal section of the ruling strata in our country, such

* Friedrich Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, International Publishers, New York, pp. 5, 16.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statements play into the hands of the defeatists.

Wallace declares that Marxism "does not believe one race is superior to another" and "has never preached international war as an instrument of national policy." But these remain empty words if one seeks to establish an artificial separation: on the one hand, "ethnic democracy"* and a peace-pursuing foreign policy, and, on the other, an inner political policy to be coupled with Prussianism and even with the Gestapo. One fails to see in that case that if here, for the first time in history, scores of different nations and nationalities are able to live together in exemplary equality, friendship, and unity, and, for the first time in history, a modern great Power has constantly stood out as the champion of peace—that this could not be save for an *inner* policy and an inner economic structure that are diametrically opposed to the Nazi-Prussian system, its policies and its instrumentations.

Soviet justice (that to which Wallace refers as the "Cheka") is an instrument in the hands of the Soviet people for ferreting out and bringing to book Fifth Columnists and would-be Quislings, for dealing effectively and in good time with its Zinovievs, Bukharins, and Tukhachevskys, its Alter and Ehrlichs—counterparts of Pétain-Laval and other present-day Benedict Arnolds. Let us remember the lesson of internally betrayed Spain which was so strongly underlined by the incident reported in the 1936 Madrid dispatch:

> "Four days before the [fascist] rebellion, the President [Azaña] assertedly told those who cautioned him against [General] Mola:
>
> " 'To prove you are wrong I have a notion to appoint General Mola chief of my military household.' "*

Soviet justice—the vigilance of the "Cheka"—stops the Molas from becoming chiefs of the military household!

Must we again wait until the truth in the reports of an American Ambassador to the Soviet Union is made public five years later, after being held back from the American people by reactionary circles in our State Department? Must we again wait "to be shown" that the Menshevik traitors Alter and Ehrlich deserved the justice of the Soviet Power which is defending its people, defending our world today against enslavement by the fascist Axis? Shall we put our trust in a mean little labor-splitting demagogue Dubinsky and his counter-revolutionary confreres of the *Jewish Daily Forward* and the *New Leader*, whose hatred of socialism is so intense that they would work toward any regime—*bar none*—to bring destruction of the Soviet Union? Cheka and Gestapo! One need but go back to the files and read carefully the correspondence of ex-Ambassador Davies, one need but ponder the words in Mr. Davies' *Mission to Moscow*, "There were no fifth col-

* "Ethnic democracy means merely that the different races and minority groups must be given equality of economic opportunity. . . . Russia has probably gone farther than any other nation in the world in practicing ethnic democracy" —Vice-President Wallace, in an address at New York City, November 8, 1942.

* *The New York Times*, September 1, 1936.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

umnists in 1941—they had shot them," to know why the traitors in the Soviet dock in 1937 and 1938 were condemned—to understand the Cheka's service to world democracy, to American democracy.

* * *

The distortion of Marxism as "the child of Prussianism" brings Wallace to read into Soviet foreign policy practices that are in direct contradiction to the pursuit of peace he has elsewhere correctly attributed to it. A Third World War, he warns, "would be inevitable if Russia should again embrace the Trotskyist idea of fomenting world-wide revolution." We shall dispense with discussing the myth of a Trotskyism connected with any revolution except counter-revolution. The real significance of Wallace's remark attaches to his seeming readiness to join in the Bolshevik-bugaboo alarm that served Hitler as a provocation in his predatory acts in Spain and throughout the Munich period, and that serves him still in his latest "peace" offensive.

How can this remark be squared with Wallace's further statement: "We must deal honestly and fairly with Russia"?

Honesty and fairness toward Russia should cause everyone to remember that the most unequivocal declaration of war objectives has been made by Joseph Stalin, and that basic to the objectives of the Soviet Union in this war is the principle set forth by its Premier on November 6, 1941:

"We have not and cannot have such war aims as imposing our will and our regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid. Our aid consists in assisting these people in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny and then setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire. No intervention whatever in the internal affairs of other peoples!"

Stalin's statement simply reaffirms the Marxist principle of the complete and unhindered right of nations to self-determination, which has guided the Soviet Union in the consistent policy it has pursued toward all peoples. The attitude of the Workers' State to that right was long ago set forth by Engels:

"The victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing."*

Our Vice-President must be aware of the fatuousness in the charge that revolutions can be "fomented." As an enlightened statesman he can hardly disagree with the statement of Engels:

"The times of that superstition which attributed revolutions to the ill will of a few agitators have long passed away. Everyone knows nowadays that wherever there is a revolutionary convulsion, there must be some social want in the background, which is prevented by outworn institutions from satisfying itself."**

And if social want and love of liberty shall stir a people to overthrow the tyranny of Hitlerism and

* Engels to Kautsky, September 12, 1882.
** *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution*, International Publishers, p. 9.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

determine its national life, shall we brand as "fomented" the struggle of that people to win for itself the Century of the Common Man? Shall we resort to "pacification," to the restoration of "order," to the imposition of puppet regimes, against the Yugoslav Constituent Assembly, against the French National Committee and the underground movement representing all shades of French anti-fascist opinion, against the peoples' movements and National Front committees of struggle and leadership? Shall we resort to a new "Non-Intervention," in behalf of a new Franco? Shall we Munichize the "fomented" people? Shall we Hooverize the feed-bag once again,* so that our food shipments for starving European children may, in the manner of 1919, be deployed to White Guard Mannerheims, to Mikhailoviches and Hapsburgs, Lavals and Peyroutons?

Clearly, not the question of "fomenting" but the question of repressing is here involved.

Of course, the war of national liberation does not determine as part of its objective the political character of each State following the victory over the fascist Axis. The fight against the Axis is the fight to destroy Hitlerism, to liberate the countries and ensure the full right of every nation to determine its form of government and way of life. Shall then the Atlantic Charter guarantee the nations the right to self-determination—short of exercising that right? Shall we allow the reactionaries to use Wallace's Century of the Common Man as a euphemism for Luce's American Century?

It is to be hoped that our Vice-President, who has won the acclaim of the peoples as an ardent champion of hemisphere unity and American-Soviet collaboration, will, in continuing in his outstanding contributions to the cause of the United Nations, not make the slightest concession to those who would block the peoples' march to freedom.

IV

Wallace associates Marxism with Prussianism "because Marx, its high priest, was molded in his thinking by Hegel, the great philosopher of the Prussian State."

Wallace gives Hegel away, body, boots, and breeches, to the Nazis, or at least to the Prussians.

Let us see what basis there is for his contention.

Marx and Engels took over and developed Hegel's philosophic method, the dialectic, which, apart from his metaphysical philosophic system, is a method of revolutionary change. Dialectics proceeds from the conception of phenomena, natural and historical, in their interconnection and interdependence; their constant movement, mutation, and development—their "constant state of coming into being and going out of being" (Engels)—through the unfolding of the conflict of inherent contradictions as the moving principle; their transition from one qualitative state to another—the old to the new, the simple to the complex, the lower to the higher,—in which the purely quantitative

* "We'll Have to Feed the World Again," Herbert Hoover, in *Colliers*, November 28, 1942.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes give rise to a qualitative leap. Only that which is arising and developing, says Stalin, is considered invincible by the dialectic method.

Marxism did not merely take over Hegel's dialectics. Hegel, though a dialectician, was not a materialist. "My dialectic method," Marx said, "is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite."

With Hegel, "the Idea" existed as an independent subject, as the driving force of the world. His philosophical idealism prevented him from drawing the necessary conclusion from his dialectic method. Though his dialectics rejected all dogma, his non-materialism brought him to the dogmatic acceptance of a metaphysical Absolute Idea, which realized itself for him in an independent principle of the State: "The State is the self-certain absolute mind. . . ." This independent State principle assumed for him a concrete form.

Thus, he welcomed the entry of the French army into Jena as the advent of bourgeois relations into Germany and is said to have called Napoleon, "The Absolute Idea on horseback."

At first sympathetic toward the French Revolution—its 1789 stage, Hegel subsequently condemned the Revolutionary Terror of 1793, and the concrete form of the State as "the self-certain absolute mind" became for him the monarchy of Frederick William III! He became the official philosopher of the Prussian State. "Thus," as Engels comments in *Ludwig Feuerbach*, "the revolutionary side [of the Hegelian philosophy] became smothered beneath the overgrowth of the conservative side."*

For Marx and Engels, the idea exists only as the mental reflection of the material world, which has primary existence. Dialectical materialism teaches that first come the people with their concrete material conditions of existence — out of which arises the State. Marx eliminated the mysticism in Hegel's dialectic.

"With him," Marx said, "it is standing on its head. It must be turned right-side up, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell.

"In its mystified form, dialectic became the fashion in Germany, because it seemed to transfigure and to glorify the existing state of things. In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors. . . ."*

Applying the rational form, Marx predicted that the universal crisis which climaxes the contradictions of this system "will drum dialectics even into the heads of the mushroom upstarts of the new holy Prusso-German empire."**

Marxism as a world conception arose and developed in struggle against Prussianism. In 1844, Marx

---

* It should be pointed out that the essence of the State envisaged by Hegel as the political realization of the Absolute Idea was not reactionary Prussianism, as is predominantly charged against him; it was rather, as Engels characterized it, a "monarchy based on estates which Frederick William III so persistently but vainly promised to his subjects, *i.e.*, in a limited moderate, indirect rule of the possessing classes suited to the petty-bourgeois German conditions of that time."

** Preface to the second edition of *Capital*.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wrote in his essay, *A Criticism of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right:*

"The day before the Reformation, official Germany was the most abject vassal of Rome. The day before its revolution, it is the abject vassal of less than Rome, of Prussia and Austria, of country squires and philistines."

As leader of the Left-democratic movement in the Rhineland, and as editor of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in 1848-49, Marx took the position that the German bourgeois-democratic revolution and the interests of German national unification, as well as the forward movement of the working class, required the destruction of the Prussian absolutist state. Thirty-five years later, in an article, "Marx and the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,*" Engels stated:

"The interests of the proletariat forbade equally the Prussianization of Germany and the perpetuation of the policy of petty states. These interests made imperative the definitive unification of Germany into a *nation,* which alone could provide the battlefield, cleared of all traditional petty obstacles, on which proletariat and bourgeoisie would measure their forces. But they equally forbade the establishment of a Prussian head; the Prussian state with its whole organization, its tradition and its dynasty was precisely the sole serious internal adversary which the revolution in Germany had to overthrow. . . ."

Marx fought the attempt to Prussianize the German labor movement. He fought the policy of Ferdinand Lassalle and Johann Schweitzer, which would have chained the working class to the feudal-absolutist reaction of the Junkers and the Crown.

The bourgeois-democratic "half revolution" of 1848 did not overcome feudal decentralization or consolidate a German national state. For decades the conflict raged about this fundamental issue. Marx and Engels advocated a democratic people's revolution. They supported the opposition of the liberal bourgeoisie to the Prussian feudalists and Junkers, because its historically progressive demands for national unification and for constitutional rights were vital to the working class in its struggle for emancipation. Cooperation of the peasantry and city middle classes with the proletariat against the main enemy—feudal reaction—would promote the independent activity of the working class as leader in the historic class alliance. It would rescue the petty-bourgeoisie from timidity and vacillation, from the fate of supporting reaction.

The Lasalleans, however, looked to Bismarck as their friend in need against the bourgeoisie. They turned to him and the landlord-royalist party for protection! They maintained that this *Realpolitik* would gain better economic conditions for the working class; but they bartered the historic class alliance and independent action of the proletariat for the "benevolent" despotism of the Prussian Crown.

The liberal bourgeoisie, fearful of the proletariat, early deserted into the arms of the feudal forces. Instead of the democratic people's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution from below, the bourgeoisie effected its monstrous "revolution from above" under the blood-and-iron sway of a bourgeois-Junker Prussian Kingdom.

Marx branded the Lassalleans: "the Royal Prussian Socialists"!

The struggle of Marxism against Prussianism showed itself further in relation to the Austro-Prussian War of 1866. After Prussia's decisive victory at Sadowa, Engels summed up the position of Marxism in the words:

"The chief disadvantage—a very great one—is the unavoidable flooding of Germany with Prussianism."*

In 1870 Marx and Engels urged the German working class to support the war against France only insofar as it remained a war of national defense against the Bonapartist designs to dismember Germany and hinder its national unification. They consistently warned against permitting the war on Germany's side to degenerate into a war of annexation in the interests of Prussian Junkerdom. They urged their followers to "emphasize the differences between German-national and dynastic-Prussian interests." They urged them to "work against any annexation of Alsace and Lorraine." The General Council of the First International, on July 23, 1870, in an Address drawn up by Marx, declared:

"If the German working class allow the present war to lose its strictly defensive character and to degenerate into a war against the French people, victory or defeat will prove alike disastrous. All the miseries that befell Germany after the so-called wars of liberation will revive with intensified violence. . . ."

After the decisive German victory at Sedan, when the Prussian King, despite guarantees to the contrary, pushed the war onward to the stage of aggression, the General Council denounced "the Prussian military camarilla [that] had resolved upon conquest." In its Second Address on the war, the International declared:

"History will measure its retribution, not by the extent of the square miles conquered from France, but by the intensity of the crime of reviving, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the policy of conquest!"

Marx, Engels, and their followers from that moment opposed Germany's war as a dynastic-Prussian war, as an unjust war.

Dynastic Prussianism before long unleashed its notorious Anti-Socialist Law of 1878 against the "dangerous activities" of the Marxists.

Marxism the child of Prussianism? Marxism, from the first, has been the antithesis and deadly enemy of Prussianism — recognized and treated as such. Marx and his followers battled against Prussian hegemony over the movement for German national unification. Prussianism's assumption of hegemony is history's penalty for the betrayal by the German bourgeoisie of the democratic people's revolution advocated by Marx. Its tragic climax in Hitler-Prussianism is history's penalty for the continued toleration

* Engels to Marx, July 25, 1866.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the German working class of the Lassalleanism of the imperialist epoch — Social-Democracy — which chained its proletarian followers to the chariot of German finance capital.

V

Wallace speaks of three dominant conceptions in the world today—Hitlerism, Marxism, and what he calls "the democratic Christian philosophy." If we examine the aspirations for a better life embodied in this "democratic Christian philosophy," we find them fulfilled in practice in the Soviet Union. The Dean of Canterbury has found that which can be called Christian in the best sense today—and what can be called Judaic, or Islamic, or Buddhist in the best sense—is social life in the State built upon the principles of Marxism. The living proof is the democratic socialized ownership of wealth; the freedom, equality, and brotherhood of all Soviet peoples; the full scope for the development of the individual;—an economic and cultural renaissance, realizing in life the principle of the Communist Manifesto: "the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."

Marxism has taught the Soviet Union how to fight in defense of its great democracy, how real national unity can be created. It has given it a system and a morale that have withstood the greatest onslaught in history. The strengthening of the American-Soviet ties and the victory of the United Nations which Wallace strives to achieve cannot be served through concessions to the slanderings of Marxism.

Who are the crusaders against Marxism? Who are the Soviet-baiters, the Red-baiters? They are the enemies of the working class and the nation; they would split the forces of the nation, where Marxism struggles for firmer unity; they would crucify labor and make this war a Roman holiday for profiteers, where Marxism defends labor's rights and decent living conditions as essential to the all-out war effort; they would sow discord among the United Nations, where Marxism seeks to strengthen their cooperation; they would undermine the Anglo-Soviet-American Alliance, where Marxism champions a fighting anti-Hitler coalition and demands the speedy opening of the Western Front. They are the enemies of what Wallace, Roosevelt, and our nation stand for in this war.

Our Vice-President's plea for deepened American-Soviet friendship, his strong warning against those who would double-cross our Soviet ally, are timely and should be heeded by all who have at heart the interests of our country and of the United Nations. They should result in resolute combat of all detractors of the Soviet Union. Our Soviet ally, who up to now has borne the brunt of the fighting, merits from all leaders in American public life at least that confidence, felt and voiced by all decent American people, which is imperative to the life of our fighting coalition. That confidence is vital to the achievement of victory and to the post-war collaboration of th-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain, which can ensure a just and durable peace. The relations of our country with the Soviet Union, in every respect—for the people, for the government, for labor—should at least be as cordial as are the British-Soviet relations, which are cemented by the Twenty-Year Mutual Assistance Treaty and by the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee. And the character of the alliance should be one of real friendship and cooperation, and, above all today, of real coalition warfare: this is essential for the consolidation of the fighting strength of the United Nations, for victory, and for future collaboration.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHICAGO REBUKES THE COPPERHEADS

BY MORRIS CHILDS

THE people of Chicago, and most notably the industrial working class, kept their eyes on the sights and with the re-election of Mayor Edward J. Kelly delivered a blow against the defeatist and Copperhead cabal. It has now been shown beyond doubt that the working people in the nation's second largest metropolis are in a fighting mood and will not tolerate obstructionism and Munichism.

The role of the working class in this most crucial election is shown in the big majorities that Mayor Kelly received in all industrial wards. Not only did Mayor Kelly and his running mates gather large majorities, but these same areas carried into office thirty-nine Democratic Councilmen out of a total of fifty running on the same platform with Kelly.

In spite of the extraordinary Republican effort to sway the Negro vote, the Negro people joined with the rest of the pro-war forces and gave a majority to Mayor Kelly.

Yet this electoral victory reveals some serious problems facing the pro-war camp. This is especially true since a great portion of the middle classes were influenced by the policies of the Chicago *Tribune* and supported the Republican candidate, McKibbin. This danger is further seen in the defection of the Chicago *Daily News* in this last election. However, this does not negate the significance of Kelly's re-election.

That Mayor Kelly understood the essence of his victory is shown in the radio talk he delivered to the people as soon as the election outcome became certain:

"The only thing I am interested in now that the issue has been decided is for all of us to form a united front regardless of faction or party, to get behind the President and help win this war."

The Chicago *Sun* and the Chicago *Times*, influential and representative newspapers, hailed the election of Mayor Kelly as proof that Chicago remains a stronghold for the New Deal and the camp of victory, and wants no part of the Hoover-McCormick-Brooks Copperhead school of thought.

The oracle of defeatism, the Chicago *Tribune*, in its editorial of April 8, takes issue with this analysis. "The election Tuesday showed the New Deal on the toboggan, coasting into well-deserved oblivion."(!) The Republican Governor of Illinois, Dwight Green, to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bolster up his followers, announced that the Chicago results heralded "a Republican landslide in 1944."

To lend plausibility to these claims, the defeatist press points to the fact that Mayor Kelly's majority of 54½ per cent of the total vote is 1½ per cent less than his majority in the 1939 election, and further that the Democratic majority in Chicago is 2 per cent less than that received by Raymond S. McKeough in the Senatorial election last fall.

The fact of the matter is that there is a preponderance of facts to show that this relative decline, which is magnified and exaggerated by the Republicans, is not at all an indication that the electorate is moving away from the pro-war camp. When we take into consideration that the polls are open only from 6 a.m. to 5 p.m., hours set in pre-war days, we see that a significant portion of Chicago's working class, who in the main are in war industries and who in a sprawling city like Chicago often have to travel hours to and from work or are working ten and twelve hour shifts that begin and end after voting hours, find it difficult and in many cases impossible to vote.

Mayor Kelly's vote undoubtedly was affected more than McKibbin's by the fact that the more than 200,000 Chicagoans in the armed forces, as a younger group, in their majority support Roosevelt and vote Democratic.

* * *

There were two major problems that had to be solved by the win-the-war camp in the course of the campaign. The first was how to properly place and relate the local issues to the major and most important issue, the winning of the war. The second was how on the basis of this understanding to achieve the greatest degree of unity in spite of the confusion that prevailed among some liberal opinion, the factionalism within the Democratic Party, and the fact that there was no newspaper that was a consistent organizer for unity and victory, while McKibbin had a powerful press preaching disunity and sowing confusion.

At the very beginning of the campaign, the reactionary Republican machine seized upon the old and time-worn but ever useful bogey of the "Kelly-Nash machine." Their obstruction to the war effort was hidden behind the slogans of smashing the "machine." McKibbin's slogan was "the home front is the main front." Such issues as the school system, transportation, local taxes, clean streets, etc., were turned into major issues.

It must be admitted that the Copperheads succeeded in diverting a section of public opinion away from the main and most important issue. A group of liberals headed by Dr. John Lapp, even if apologetically, joined with the reactionary camp on the ground that McKibbin must be elected to reform the school system! In answer to those who expressed amazement at his association with McKibbin, Dr. Lapp attempted to argue that it was an insult to his and the President's intelligence to say that to support the President one had to vote for Kelly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Lapp conveniently overlooked the fact that the Republican candidate was the spearhead in the drive against the President's war policy, while Mayor Kelly represented those forces that supported the people's war against the Axis.

Dr. Lapp and those who followed him did not want to see through the Republican trap. The aim of the Republicans was not to improve the school system, but, by demagogically raising these questions, to distract from the main issue and the war effort. As the Communist Party warned in its election platform, the real aim of McKibbin, McCormick, Green and the Republican machine was to win the elections as a powerful lever to hold back the development of the war offensive, to work for a negotiated peace, and strengthen their positions for the 1944 elections.

Quite early in the campaign McKibbin dropped his attempts to limit himself to so-called local issues, but attacked the President and his war policies, made public speeches against rationing, resorted to the bogey of "Communism," and used every weapon in the arsenal of the Hitlerites. In the midst of the discussion on the vital question of the Second Front in Europe and the problem of U.S.-Soviet relations, Mr. McKibbin inserted advertisements into a number of foreign-language newspapers and tried to stir up enmity against the Soviet Union. For example, one of his main election appeals to the Lithuanian people was: "Protest against the Soviet and Communist grab of Lithuania!"

Around the candidacy of McKibbin rallied all the anti-Roosevelt, anti-labor, anti-Semitic, America First, and John L. Lewis forces. The most reactionary section of the N.A.M. sent its representatives into the city of Chicago to raise funds, to make speeches, and to organize votes for McKibbin. Outstanding reactionary Republican Congressmen and Senators from other states participated actively in the campaign in Chicago, lending emphasis to the real national stakes at issue. The Lewis henchmen, with Ray Edmundson at their head, spent thousands of dollars in last-minute radio talks and newspaper advertisements, using the name of the defunct "Labor's Non-Partisan League," in an attempt to divide labor.

In the closing stages of the campaign a number of liberals (not including Dr. Lapp) dissociated themselves from McKibbin and endorsed Mayor Kelly.

* * *

A surprising and serious obstacle in organizing the pro-war forces was the attitude and role of the Chicago *Daily News*, published by Colonel Knox, Secretary of the Navy and a member of the Cabinet. Chicagoans knew the *Daily News* as a conservative newspaper whose position on economic and labor questions is not very progressive, but which at the same time held a position on foreign policy which is anti-Axis. In the November Congressional elections the *Daily News*, although traditionally Republican, supported McKeough, the Demo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crat, as against the Republican defeatist Brooks.

In this city election campaign, the *Daily News* carried on the most vigorous campaign in behalf of McKibbin. It can be said that the *Daily News*, more than any other force, served to confuse and disorganize the pro-war camp. Since the *Daily News* could not defend McKibbin's attitude on the war and on foreign policy, the most it could say in editorials was "he is simply a good and very able citizen." It was hard for Colonel Knox and his paper to square McKibbin's position with the *Daily News*' outlook on national and international affairs. But once the *Daily News* took this position, it followd the line of putting the main emphasis on local issues, as did the appeaser backers of McKibbin.

It even argued that a vote for Kelly would be understood as a vote for a fourth term for Roosevelt and, while admitting that this is a global war, it polemized against the "global Ultima Thule complex," saying, in plain language, that the average citizen should not try to influence international affairs, that "democracy must be achieved from the bottom up, not from the top down; it must have its roots, not in a League of Nations but in the home precinct." It argued further that to support Kelly for mayor was a violation of the principles of democracy and it characterized such action as on a par with the appeasement of Hitler; attempted to prove that those who opposed the policy of the appeasement of Franco and Darlan contradicted their principles in voting for Kelly.

What prompted the pro-war *Daily News* to permit itself to become an organ for those groups and forces which fight most bitterly against our national interests? This anomaly can be explained, among other things, by the fact that those responsible for the policies of the Chicago *Daily News* became involved in the factional struggle inside the Republican Party, sparring for advantageous positions in preparation for 1944. In doing this they surrendered their principles, which resulted in a position that placed partisan interests above the welfare of our country. As is usual, the Copperheads were not satisfied, even with such concessions, for on the morrow after the election the Chicago *Tribune* attacked those who in its opinion had not fought boldly enough against Roosevelt, had not gone far enough in their attacks on the Administration. For all its "good" labors, the Chicago *Daily News* was accused of being a "fifth columnist" within the ranks of the Republican Party.

Colonel McCormick and those for whom he speaks have made up their minds that nothing short of complete surrender to their policies will satisfy them. Their position is stated most clearly in the editorial of the Chicago *Tribune* of April 8:

"The election shows that Chicago [by which McCormick means the *Tribune*] will have nothing of Willkie-ism, nothing of Roosevelt Republicans, nothing of the policy to subordinate American interests to foreign ones on every possible occasion. The Republican Party is and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must remain the American party. The Democratic Party is the international party, or rather the foreign party."

Those groups who want national unity to win this war cannot hope to achieve this aim by compromising with the defeatists. This is a lesson that must not be lost.

The victory of Mayor Kelly was not only a blow against the Copperhead Republicans, but at the same time a defeat of the anti-Administration Democrats, who are under the leadership of James Farley.

The outcome of the Chicago elections also determined the leadership of the Democratic Party in Illinois, and its national role within the party. Under the leadership of Mayor Kelly the Illinois Democrats have been the staunchest upholders of the Administration's policies within that party. Mr. Farley and those for whom he speaks tried to utilize these elections to weaken the position of those Democrats who support the President, particularly Mayor Kelly. The Chicago *Tribune* lent its support to this effort. The bait held out to Democrats aspiring for office was that such positions can be attained only in opposition to the New Deal.

Who are the people in Chicago that represent this Farley tendency? It is a group within the Democratic Party, led by Chicago's State Attorney, Thomas J. Courtney. This group has yet to express itself on the war and foreign policy. If it did, it would most likely speak the language of Colonel McCormick and James Farley. Not once during the mayoralty campaign did Thomas J. Courtney give a word of encouragement or endorsement to Mayor Kelly. On the contrary, this group maneuvered in a number of wards to elect its men as committeemen, and it was no secret that Farley aimed to line up these people and use them for capturing the Democratic Party nationally.

Wherever the people were aware of this conspiracy they organized and defeated the Copperhead Democrats of Farley. An outstanding example was the Fifth Ward, where these groups united behind the candidacy of Lindheimer for Councilman. Lindheimer's election would have been a victory for the Farley-Courtney Democrats. All the win-the-war forces, with labor playing an outstanding role, united to deliver a stinging rebuke to such conspiracies. The progressive candidate, Bertram B. Moss, received 20,296 votes to H. G. Lindheimer's 10,187, an impressive majority of two to one.

Kelly's campaign, as in the November elections, was adversely affected by the error of Administration leaders in failing to participate in this election, so highly important to the nation. This lack of aggressiveness on the part of the national Administration even influenced Kelly in the early stages of the campaign not to emphasize the war question as the central issue of the election struggle. In contradistinction was the support given McKibbin's campaign by the national leadership of the Republican Party. This passivity of Administration leaders gave encour-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agement to Farleyites as well as the Republicans to wean away Democratic support from Kelly.

* * *

It is clear that the election of the victory candidates was due in a decisive measure to the greater consciousness, organization and participation of labor, which, despite the lack of C.I.O.-A. F. of L. unity, was most influential in determining the outcome of the election.

Both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. set up election committees for the re-election of Mayor Kelly. The C.I.O. committee, for example, mobilized labor in the election on the following platform:

"1. Patriotic labor is 100 per cent behind the President's slogan of unconditional surrender of the Axis.

"2. We have rolled up our sleeves for all-out production at home, for the immediate offensive on the European continent to destroy Hitler and his fascist partners now. Labor will make every necessary sacrifice to achieve this victory.

"3. Labor must and will turn out to the polls to re-elect Mayor Kelly to his post of leadership in Chicago, as a demonstration of Chicago's unswerving support of the patriotic war leadership of our country and behind the policies of our Commander-in-Chief."

The local leadership of the labor movement was mobilized through meetings of shop stewards, through conferences with local union officials, and through plant and shop-gate meetings. As a result, the real issues in the elections were clarified and emphasized.

Labor, through its own committees, conducted a series of broadcasts. Outstanding A. F. of L. and C.I.O. leaders, among them Victor Olander, Secretary-Treasurer of the Illinois Federation of Labor, and Fullerton Fulton, Chairman of the Cook County C.I.O. Council, spoke. A number of trade union newspapers hammered home on the issues at stake.

Local trade union election committees were set up in important wards. In the Second Ward, the most important Negro area, the South Side Labor Victory Committee, a joint C.I.O.-A. F. of L. committee, functioned very effectively. It based itself on the real issues of the campaign. It was due to the activity of this committee that the Negro people rallied to give the majority vote to Mayor Kelly and to elect a Democratic Alderman. The most important Negro newspaper, the Chicago *Defender*, joined in the campaign for Kelly, and helped to expose George B. McKibbin as an upholder of the hated system of restrictive covenants, reprinting a photostatic copy of a restrictive covenant contract which Mr. McKibbin had signed.

In some cases, when Aldermanic candidates resorted to name calling, instead of bringing forward the issues, the trade unions called them to order. Typical was the action of the 45th Ward C.I.O. Legislative Committee, which put out newspaper ads entitled, *"Stop the Political Monkeyshines! We Have a War to Win,"* reminding the candidates that labor and the people wanted to know what these can-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

didates were doing to help solve the hundreds of new problems that confront the people as a result of our war to defeat fascism. Labor's better understanding of the real issues was typified in the ward program the Legislative Committee presented:

"Are You Prepared to Use Your Office To:

"(1) Give full support to President Roosevelt. (2) To stop the black market, and profiteering in food. To lower the ceilings on food prices. (3) To urge our country to immediately start a Second Front and lick Hitler in 1943. (4) Unmask the friends of Hitler in our country and defeat the appeasers. (5) To fight for a real tax program that will not soak the lower income groups. (6) To establish nurseries in the Ward to care for children of women war workers. (7) To lower the street car fare to 7 cents."

For a period of months now the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. in Illinois have been cooperating on legislative and other vital questions. Yet this same type of close cooperation was lacking in the election campaign. While both organizations set up committees to work for the election of Kelly, they functioned separately, and thereby did not exert all of the strength and influence that labor can transmit to national unity and victory. It must be stated that if a joint labor committee did not materialize it was not due to the resistance of the C.I.O. to such action. Undoubtedly a united labor front would have influenced sections of the middle classes to join with the pro-war camp against McKibbin.

As we have already stated, the support for Kelly came in the main from the working class wards. McKibbin's campaign found the most success among the middle classes. This large section of the population did not so vote because they were anti-war. Traditionally Republican, they were fooled by McKibbin's emphasis upon certain economic difficulties facing the small businessman, storekeeper, salespeople, etc., growing out of dislocations caused by the war. These are the people among whom the *Daily News* has particular influence, and its playing up of local issues and appealing to party loyalty undoubtedly resulted in many tens of thousands of McKibbin votes.

In the November elections many of these same voters, following the appeal for national unity on the part of the Chicago *Daily News*, broke with their traditional Republicanism and voted for the Democratic candidate McKeough. This explains why McKeough's majority in Chicago was greater than Kelly's present majority.

In this situation, when unity of all the people is so necessary in the fight against the appeasers and for victory, it is of utmost importance that the progressive and labor movement unmask the Copperhead role of the Chicago *Tribune's* leadership of the Republican Party.

* * *

More than ever the Communist Party in this election was a forceful factor in rallying the people. The defeatists resorted to the usual Hitler method of anti-Communism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Red-scare to divide the camp of national unity. This cry, echoed by McKibbin and the Copperheads around him, met with signal failure. The Communist Party worked together with the labor movement and the entire win-the-war camp in harmony and unity. Communists were active in the trade unions, in the communities and in all other mass organizations. We saw our main role to be that of cementing the united effort of the people for victory on the battlefield *and* on the home front.

The Communist Party had its own program of demands and its own candidates, but this in no way conflicted with the united effort of the win-the-war camp; it rather strengthened it. Through participation in the election campaign as an independent force while cooperating with others, we were able to bring clarity into the campaign. When toward the end of the campaign we deemed it necessary and practical, in the interests of electing the win-the-war candidates headed by Mayor Kelly, to withdraw the Communist candidates, this act was understood and approved by the people.

The Communist Party issued hundreds of thousands of pieces of literature, held numerous meetings, and conducted a consistent radio campaign for a period of two months over one of the largest radio stations in the country.

The Communists were most instrumental in exposing the real intent behind McKibbin's demagogic stress on local issues, and in correctly relating these secondary issues to the main issues. We warned that while the war must stand in the forefront it would be wrong to ignore such questions as transportation, schools and taxes; but at the same time we showed how to treat these questions.

We indicated, for instance, that if the State Commerce Commission, made up of McKibbin's cronies, would quit sabotaging Chicago's transportation problem, this could immediately proceed to ease the bad transportation situation in the city. But we further pointed out that today Governor Green's machine does nothing to help the war workers, whose energies are sapped by tiring rides on crowded and uncomfortable street cars. We showed that this is certainly a handicap to war production; we exposed McKibbin's political ties and family ties with the traction barons and how his election would result in a further increase in fares.

To clear up the confusion in the minds of many about the school problem, we showed that the Republican candidate McKibbin, as a leading member of the Civic Federation, never took objection to the attempts of that body to curtail educational facilities, but agreed with that body's attempt to cut school appropriations and salaries of school teachers. We showed that we are concerned with providing the best possible education for our children and involving the schools, as they are involved now, in the war effort. We warned the people that the McKibbin reactionaries could not improve or develop our educational system, but, on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contrary, would in all probability engage in witch-hunting and book-burning as former Republican Mayor William Hale Thompson did.

We approached many other local issues in a similar way.

In the last weeks of the campaign a lot of emphasis was placed upon the mobilization of the people for the opening up of a western European front, showing that the enemies of the people are those who oppose the Second Front and hinder the cooperation of our country with the Soviet Union and the other United Nations; that in the election campaign were involved not only local problems but the very question of national survival.

It was during this struggle for unity and victory in this election campaign that the Communist Party increased its membership by one-third.

* * *

Without underestimating the importance of the Chicago election victory, we must nevertheless draw certain obvious conclusions which are necessary if the lessons of this campaign are not to be lost. While it is true that labor played a most important role, it cannot be denied that a greater effort is necessary in the struggle for labor unity. A united labor movement, expressed through joint political action and collaboration, would not only have been able to influence the numerical results of the election, but would at the same time overcome other weaknesses such as bringing the middle classes and other non-working class sections of the population more actively in the struggle against reaction.

The election results are a warning in preparation for 1944, as well as for their effect on current war policy. The defeatists still have a great influence in downstate Illinois. The Chicago majority cast for the pro-war candidates will not be sufficient in a state-wide election contest to overcome the Republican influence in the rest of Illinois, unless a united labor movement, in collaboration with the Roosevelt Democrats and Willkie Republicans, succeeds in drawing to the pro-war camp other large sections of the population from among the middle classes and the farmers. This conclusion and task are especially urgent if the present Congress is to be influenced, and if the anti-Hitler camp is to be strengthened now and in connection with the developing political realignments and struggles.

The Illinois labor movement is once again moving forward in the struggle for national unity and progress on the home front, for effecting a solution of the urgent problems of economic stabilization and all-out war production, and especially for helping ensure the opening of a Second Front in Europe. There is a growing consciousness that if the Copperheads are to be defeated decisively the people must take a more active and organized part in influencing our government's policies, particularly to speed the invasion of Europe. In the process of this struggle against Hitlerism, labor will rally the people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

BY ROBERT MINOR

[Editor's Note: *The* St. Louis Post-Dispatch, *one of the largest and most influential newspapers of the United States, recently published a series of articles as a symposium of the views of representative men and women in answer to the question, "What Are We Fighting For?" Contributors of articles included Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State; former Governor Herbert H. Lehman of New York; Eric A. Johnston, President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Governor Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota; Monsignor John A. Ryan, Director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; the Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, Episcopal Bishop of Missouri; and Robert Minor. President Roosevelt and Vice-President Wallace greeted the opening of the symposium in letters to the newspaper. Robert Minor's contribution to the symposium of the* St. Louis Post-Dispatch *is reprinted here by courtesy of that newspaper.*]

THE Three Tailors of Tooley Street, so the story goes, came together and resolved "We, the people of London—." It is amazing how many trios of tailors there are now in Tooley Street or if not in Tooley Street perhaps Main Street or Broadway, and if not tailors, perhaps publicists—engaged in resolving what "we," the 900,000,000 people and millionfold armies of thirty-one nations—of China, the Philippines, Americans and British in the South Pacific, Russians on the enormous front that is the biggest the world ever knew, and Free Frenchmen, Englishmen and Americans in Africa—are fighting for. I am seriously disturbed by this epidemic of discovery by each that his own pet nostrum had suddenly become the objective for which whole nations are fighting and dying. The impulse is to find that the sweet panacea that one always wished one's neighbor would listen to is now the object for which the biggest war of all time is being fought by the millions who had never heard of this panacea.

I met an earnest man on the subway train who assured me that the real objective of this war is vegetarianism. Although I am opposed to vegetarianism, and though Hitler is a vegetarian, I don't think this is a war either for or against vegetarianism. I have heard that dozens of super-efficient gentlemen are quietly spreading the word that the millions are really making war for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

technocracy, but I am inclined to think it is an error.

Aside from the ludicrous, we must look soberly at the deadly serious danger that our enemies have made of the spurious objectives invented by the Nazis, deliberately as crackpot delusions for the subversion of their victims. The bestial pretense that this is a "race" war has served effectively as a screen behind which is carried on the hideous epic of murder of millions of cultured people of Europe. We must be on guard against even well-meaning substitutions for the real objectives of this war. The use made of the lie that it is a war for a "New Order" in Europe and Asia should be a warning to us not to invent "new orders" of our own fancy, as purely imagined objectives of this war. We need no "new order," neither a valid nor a synthetic, invented one, as an incentive to fight to preserve the accumulated achievements of three centuries of civilization.

* * *

To my mind some of the quite rational or at least sober and decent suggestions for postwar set-ups of one kind or another—*when they are offered as objectives of the war*—can be almost as dangerous as the less sober ones. For instance, in my opinion, a great world agreement or union of nations for collective security and maintenance of peace on a world scale is quite a sensible proposal; I think that it ought to be and almost surely will be adopted. But my opinion as to the salutory character of such an arrangement must not deceive me into thinking that it is the objective for which this war is being fought. My party and I have been among the strongest advocates of collective security under an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the French Republic and China since 1935 when we insisted in vain that peace be enforced collectively by military and naval sanctions against Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia. I think the validity of that position has been proved a hundred times over by the ghastly results of the contrary course, when we failed to make a world front against the stealthy Hitler-Mussolini invasion and overthrow of the Spanish Republic and the martyrization of Czechoslovakia. I am firmly convinced that the lesson will be learned and the nations will achieve such an arrangement by prolonging the present United Nations agreement after the close of military action in this war.

But I am under no illusion that this belief of mine answers the question as to what the 900,000,000 men, women and children are fighting for in this war.

What is the objective without which there would have been no military resistance to the German, Japanese and Italian armies? When we answer this question we find the great common denominator that moves the hearts and minds and fighting arms uniformly of all Chinese, Filipino, Free French, Russians, Americans and Englishmen. That objective is to prevent the conquest of their countries by a foreign invader.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the question: What are we fighting for? it would be impossible to give a more true or simple answer than that given by President Roosevelt on Lincoln's birthday:

"In every battalion, in every ship's crew you will find every kind of American citizen representing every occupation, every section, every origin, every religion and every political viewpoint.

"Ask them what they are fighting for and every one of them will say: 'I am fighting for my country.'"

We are fighting for our country. If amplification is needed, we are fighting to prevent the rule of our country by a foreign conqueror.

We did not begin a war to acquire something we did not have. We are fighting to keep something. Our objective in this war is the survival of the United States; and, arising from that need of survival, we are fighting collectively for the survival of all free peoples in union with whom alone we find survival possible.

I don't think it is jobs, or social security. I am simple enough, if simple it is, to believe that the whole armed force of the United States would go into this war and fight without flinching to the bitter end if every man knew that on his return to his home after victory he would find conditions no better than they were at the end of the first World War, without jobs or security. I am naive enough, if naivete it is, to believe that American Joads would fight to keep foreign invaders from ruling the Panhandle of Oklahoma.

Millions of Chinese who in their whole lives, and whose parents and grandparents in their whole lives never knew a day without hunger and misery, are fighting like tigers and have fought for six years uninterruptedly to drive the Japanese invaders out of their poverty-stricken valleys and hills, without the slightest guarantee, excepting their own hopes and courage, that there will be a better life at the end of the war. I say this while advising reactionaries not to bank on this heroism and patriotism to the extent of trying to deny either Americans or Chinese a realization of their hopes for a better life after the war, because whoever does is going to get hurt.

In his letter to the Editor of the *Post-Dispatch* President Roosevelt spoke of this as a discussion of "the aims and objectives for which the United States and the United Nations are fighting." To this way of putting the question, the answer can be the simple common denominator. I am impressed with the validity of Vice President Wallace's outlook on the postwar world, and everyone knows that he and the President are in full agreement and single-minded both for the all-out war policy and in postwar perspective. But for the purposes of this particular discussion, Mr. Wallace's description of the subject as "the type of postwar world we must build if we are to avoid world war No. 3," does not evoke the answer that expresses the great common denominator.

There seems to be very slight possibility, for example, for Generals de Gaulle and Giraud to agree now on the "type of postwar" France that Frenchmen "must build" after

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the war, and if one waits until after these and other French patriots can agree upon a "type of postwar" France, and if the rest of us wait with them, it is obvious that the postwar France will be built not by Frenchmen but by Germans. If the British trade unions and the British Conservative Party found no common objective for the war until they could agree on "the type of postwar" England, then Rudolf Hess' parachute jump to the English countryside would prove to have been not in vain.

Under the goad of Nazi slavery in blood-soaked Europe, all Frenchmen, Norwegians, Belgians, Dutchmen, all Englishmen, Greeks, Yugoslavs—and even some newly awakening Italians and Bulgarians—are finding the common objective that will move the very mountains. Generals de Gaulle and Giraud can agree upon "the aims and objectives for which" the whole of France will fight, when we see that these ains and objectives sum up in the driving of the German and Italian invaders from their soil and that Frenchmen alone and not Germans will decide the "type of postwar" France.

Take another example. Two military forces of Yugoslavs are operating in Yugoslavia. General Mikhailovich had long claimed to be fighting the German invader, but admitted that his military operations were modified to conform to a particular "postwar" preoccupation. Operations, supposedly aimed at driving the German armies out of Yugoslavia, had to be modified to conform to the goal in a "type of postwar" Yugoslavia, that is, a Yugoslavia to be ruled by the "Greater Serb" Party. The result is the inevitable. The supposed fighting against the German armies faded into no fighting at all, supposed or real. And there is evidence to prove that agreements were reached by Mikhailovich with the commanders of the German army of occupation. Nothing would be done by Mikhailovich that might result in successes of the other and larger military force of Yugoslavs, the "Partisans."

The second and larger Yugoslav army, the "Partisans" is composed of men of a wide range of political views, including Communists, republicans, Serbian patriots, conservatives and even monarchists who favor the Karageorgevich dynasty but who place the driving of the German army out of Yugoslavia ahead of dynastic questions. It fights with only the one objective—to free Yugoslavia of the foreign invader. Postwar "types" of government will be settled after the war, but by Yugoslavs, not Germans. The truth is evident that the war can be won only by the course followed by these "Partisans," and will inevitably be lost if the course of Mikhailovich is followed.

* * *

One of the postwar concerns of Congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce —a fear that the lend-lease planes we send to England may be used in commercial competition with our own aviation companies after the war—is another example. Obviously, if we permitted our sending

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of bombing planes to the British to be modified by such "postwar" considerations, there would be less rubble in German tank factories. Or if we held back on production with full speed ahead and labor-management cooperation to that end, in fear that it might strengthen the "postwar" position of trade unions in a great plant, it is the country itself that would be endangered by allowing this "postwar" problem to impinge upon purely war considerations.

The only postwar problem that has any present reality is the problem of who will be the victor after the war. From the point of view of action, of decision, there are no "postwar" problems, but only war problems. Literally there is only one problem whose solution we can affect in the slightest degree by anything that we do now, and that is the all-decisive question whether the postwar problems will be solved by Adolf Hitler or by the United States and its Allies.

The postwar prospect for the United States is a brilliant one if but two things are assured:

First: That we are the victors.

Second: That the coalition of nations upon whose strength we depend for the victory is solid enough and is given sufficient momentum to last through the war and into the period when there will be postwar problems.

Is winning the war limited to beating the enemy? Up to a certain point, it *is*. And if we don't see to it that everything is limited to the beating of the enemy up to the point where he is beaten, we are not going to win this war. One is fully justified by common sense and by all experience of war in insisting that everything we do is limited and conditioned by the one objective of defeating the enemy. If we don't it may be not the enemy that is defeated, but ourselves.

In concrete terms, if we consider as supreme this one objective, we will immediately complete the great military action that began with the landing in Africa. That completion can only be in the carrying of the action over into an offensive in the heart of Western Europe. If we were to consider some other question as coming before the question of military decision, it is conceivable that we might delay about fulfilling the purpose of the African landing in a European landing.

An extremely interesting editorial in the *New York Times* of March 2, committing that paper for the first time to the throwing of our full weight into a Western European front, indicates a realization that without such action by us and by our British ally, it is not Soviet Russia so much as the United States and Great Britain that are most endangered. There is a growing realization that the failure to launch the European action may bring us a disastrous situation. The editorial expresses a fear that there may be a deadlock on the Eastern Front while western Europe may be closed and locked in the possession of the German power. Our great army and that of England may be isolated in Africa through our delay in taking advantage of the present Russian offensive for our own offensive in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western Europe. The effect upon the war in the Pacific is conceived to be of extremely grave character, with our forces unable to face away from Europe.

* * *

Is planning necessary?

Yes. *But plan the war first.* Do we realize that, with the greatest admiration of the truly magnificent achievements in the building of our army and navy and air force, and our partial achievements in the field of production, one of the most serious dangers to the war effort lies in the fact that *our production is not planned?* The fact is that huge gaps in the mobilization and coordination of our national production machinery constitute a veritable Kasserine Pass in our defense through which both economic and political and finally military disasters can break upon us.

Let us beware of the fatal concept that we are too strong and rich to be destroyed. On a dark street infested by armed foodpads, what does it mean to be the richest pedestrian in sight? In an Axis-dominated world the United States is the surest of all countries to be destroyed.

Let us get over the superstition that we command a majority of the mobilizable forces of the world and that we are now in the stage of "postwar" problems. Without the slightest pessimism about the capacity of our Russian ally, and merely for the sake of argument, suppose that the armies of the Soviet Union that are now holding 240 divisions of Germans and allies of Hitler on the Eastern Front were to be defeated, as nearly every military expert in the whole non-Russian world said only a year and a half ago that they certainly would be. Within the briefest time the mightiest military force ever seen in the world would sweep upon our incomparably smaller armies and those of our British allies in North Africa like an avalanche upon a matchbox. The whole weight of Europe, Asia and Africa, with the captive navies of all of Europe and Asia, easily commanding all oceans, would be at the disposal of military forces thrown across the Atlantic to Brazil. Let us quit assuming this is an "ordinary" war like the last one.

Lenin once, in arguing that the war of 1914-18 was an imperialist war, pointed out that if the German armies were then to take St. Petersburg and Paris; it would not result in German rule over Russia and France, but only in a redivision of colonial empires in favor of Germany with some minor seizures of border provinces such as Alsace and Lorraine.

But what of the present war? By the inexorable logic of the forces in struggle, Paris is seized and France is bodily and totally ruled from Berlin, and beyond doubt the purpose of the Axis includes the same outright rule of England, and could only be so, because Hitler's survival depends upon the ending of British independence, which can be ended only by permanent occupation. The same is true of us. The most outstanding fact of history is that the kind of rule that Japan imposes upon China—which in our vanity we thought could be attempt-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed only against "colonial peoples"—is now imposed upon the Continent of Europe, and intended to be imposed on England and the United States. The whole nature of the struggle of Hitler-Germany, of fascist Italy and militarist Japan is that which results in the bodily seizure and rule over all of the countries including the most advanced countries of Europe and America that can be conquered by military force.

This is not "just another" war. It is a war for and against three centuries of human progress in national independence and democracy.

Are we then fighting, not to acquire something new, but only to keep something old? Are we fighting to preserve old injustices, toward, for instance the Philippines, or China or India? In short, are we fighting for the *status quo ante?*

History knows no *status quo ante.* There is never a return to a previous historic condition, and this profound truth is the undoing of every reactionary. History does not move in a circle. History "repeats itself" only on a higher plane. Those who think that history moves in a circle and returns to a point of departure are deceived; it proves to be not a circle but a spiral; he who has been robbed of democracy, or whose democracy is attacked, and who fights to preserve that democracy, inevitably finds in the victory that his democracy has been raised to a higher level in the fighting. It was so in our great Civil War of '61. Lincoln and the nation fought to preserve the Union, and succeeded in what seemed in prospect to be the preservation of the old Union. But history could not return to the old Union; it returned to a Union that was old in part, but new in the enormous absence of chattel slavery.

In this war also we are fighting to preserve what we have, our old democracy as it was before Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini. But that old democracy will be stronger; and is it not now already clear that our heroic brother nation the Philippines and we of the United States must come out of this war in a higher relationship that contains freedom and independence for the Philippines? We are fighting to break the hold of Japan upon China. The world contains no fool so utter as to believe that in the victory China will be returned to the *status quo ante* in which Western imperialism held extraterritorial privileges or that England or any other power will ever again be ensconced in the great Hong Kongs and Shanghais of a victorious China. To defeat Japan the huge peoples of Asia, comprising half the population of the world, must of necessity be awakened, and in the Asia that has broken that stranglehold of Japanese conquest there is not the slightest possibility that any power on earth can deal again with a single one of the larger countries of Asia otherwise than on a basis of equality and independence. One of the strangest phenomena of the day is the persistence of a belief that India will, or can by any turn of history, be ruled after this war by any European or other foreign power, if once the Japanese hold upon China is broken.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The act of defeating the Axis is indeed the act of determining the character of the peace in all of its ramifications. Those are wrong who say "we can win the war and lose the peace." It too often accompanies persuasive arguments against the rapid and full mobilization of our military forces. And too often it is made to mean: Let us not worry about the war, let us begin a quarrel about the peace.

Plan the peace? Yes, but plan the war first, and if you plan it well enough to achieve a democratic victory you will have done all of the planning of a peace that is possible now, with one reservation.

The reservation is of great importance. It arises out of the fact that there is no hard and fast division between the relations of nations in war and their relations in peace. A certain radius of "planning the peace" is in fact at the same time a strengthening of the mutual relations and confidence between the allies in the war, quite necessary to effective fighting and not a diversion from complete devotion to the one objective of victory. Every war visualizes an end of military action and the beginning of other forms of activity based upon the results of the victory. This is inescapable.

Gen. Carl von Clausewitz, who coined the famous aphorism that "War is a continuation of state policy by other (*i.e.*, forceful) instruments," also pointed out that peace is a continuation by peaceful means of the foreign policies which had been followed in war.

Any failure to achieve such consistency is a break-down of state policy. Uncertainty as to whether the respective members of an alliance will follow such a consistent policy is a dangerous weakness.

Clausewitz said in effect that in coalition warfare success "depends on the cordiality of the alliance." That cordiality to some degree depends upon confidence in the consistency of future peace policy with present war policy. In our present war of coalition it is absolutely necessary that the United Nations permit no doubt that their common purpose applies consistently both to the war and to the peace.

The war alliance of the United Nations should be given now that enormous reinforcement that can be achieved by a firm and clear understanding that the collaboration of the period of war in the art of destruction will continue after the war in the art of construction and the keeping of the peace. The 20-year treaty between Great Britain and the Soviet Union, which can and should be extended to the United States and to other nations, is the harbinger of such an agreement. With full confidence in its assurance of collaboration after the war, we must add a realistic appreciation of the strength that it can give to the momentum of the war effort without which all else will turn to ashes.

Hitler's propaganda is all of one pattern now—to make us fear the victory. To make us fear the victory of our Allies, England and the Soviet Union, is the easiest way to make us fear our own victory; and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we know now that Soviet Russia will not be defeated.

France, official France, the France that turned out to be Laval and Pétain—feared the victory. Let's not go that way. Let's not find "postwar" reasons to pull our punches.

The all-decisive postwar problem is: Who will be the victor?—whether our country will be defeated and collapse in a ruin of civilization so colossal and a slavery so degrading that it is almost impossible for the mind to grasp it, or whether our country, together with its allies in a powerful coalition, is victorious.

Let us determine this problem now. The problem of victory is the problem of compelling the German army to face two ways. If we do this, we will have the key which will unlock all postwar problems—the victory of the coalition of the United Nations, which is truly a democratic coalition. Clemenceau will not write the treaty.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON WAGE STABILIZATION

BY WILLIAM AND PAULINE YOUNG

A Discussion Article with a Reply by GILBERT GREEN

GILBERT GREEN, in his article in the March issue of *The Communist*, "Some Problems of Economic Stabilization," makes a notable contribution to our thinking on this vital issue. However, it seems to us that in this discussion of wages, Comrade Green has failed to put his finger on the basic defects in the policies of the government and the War Labor Board.

He points out correctly that when labor accepted the Little Steel formula it did so in good faith and with the understanding that other phases of the war economy would be stabilized along with wages. It was understood that the cost of living would be controlled and that essential commodities which were scarce would be rationed. It was likewise understood that excess profits would be curbed and that a sound tax program, based on ability to pay, would be instituted.

So far, the conditions of this acceptance have not been lived up to. The result has been an increasing dissatisfaction with the wage stabilization policy of the government. The four cardinal principles of the War Labor Board's wage program are the following: (1) Correction of "maladjustments," that is, application of the 15 per cent rule of the Little Steel formula; (2) Correction of inequalities and gross inequities; (3) elimination of sub-standards of living; and (4) Aid in the effective prosecution of the war. The general dissatisfaction with the wage policy has been primarily directed toward seeking an upward adjustment in the Little Steel formula. Comparatively little attention has been given by the unions and the War Labor Board to the other three points of the wage policy which, if properly applied, are flexible enough to provide the framework of a sound wage policy.

Comrade Green points out correctly:

"Even if the Little Steel formula were to be revised upward, if this were not accompanied by effective price control and a tax program based on ability to pay, the problem we face today would only repeat itself a few months later. It would be the case of the tortoise, wages, chasing the hare, prices."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He then suggests as a substitute for the Little Steel formula another formula for cost of living adjustments, through which wages, during the war, could be periodically adjusted to the rising cost of living. This formula, he claims, would give a more flexible and lasting answer to the wage problem for the duration of the war. He claims it would accomplish a number of things: (1) Establish the principle of wage stabilization in a workable fashion; (2) Provide a new incentive for enforcement of price ceilings on the part of the government; (3) Break the bottleneck in the War Labor Board, and (4) Through the accomplishment of wage stabilization enable the workers to turn their attention to matters of production.

We are in accord with Comrade Green when he sets out to seek a formula and approach that can give a more flexible and lasting answer to the question of wages than the Little Steel formula. However, we do not believe the solution he suggests differs in any fundamental way from the Little Steel formula itself. We do not believe it is possible to find a mechanical formula which can be applied by rule of thumb to solve the problem of wage stabilization. In this connection the labor members of the National War Labor Board, in their dissenting opinion in the West Coast Airframe Companies case, stated,

"It needs to be emphasized that there is no rule of thumb or static wage formula that can be applied mechanically in wage cases to the end of producing wage stabilization."

What is really needed is an approach to the wage question which takes into account not only the factor of economic stabilization but also the vital questions of productivity, workers' morale and efficiency. Browder quite clearly stated in his speech of August 29, 1942,

"Wages must be dealt with upon the basis of providing the most efficient working class for the tasks of production consistent with the supply of consumers' goods and services that can be made available in the country in an all-out war economy. The moment we look beyond the money form of wages and think in terms of the actual needs of production essential for victory in the war, the question of wages takes on an entirely new significance."

Labor can make its most valuable contribution to War Labor Board policies by giving meaning to the phrase "effective prosecution of the war," an established but little-used criterion for wage increases.

We do not agree that the cost of living adjustment is a final or even partial answer to the wage problem for the reasons which we set forth below:

Cost of Living Is Not the Basic Approach to Wages. In peacetime we have held that cost of living considerations alone were not sufficient in determining a wage policy. To base wage increases merely on the cost of living factor is to presuppose the worker is adequately compensated in the first place and receives his due share of the value of his product.

The question arises whether in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wartime we should retreat from this position to the philosophy that we should maintain only the workers' real wages, measured in terms of a "peacetime standard," or whether we should adopt an entirely new philosophy based on the requirements of the war program.

Cost of Living Adjustments Do Not Guarantee Real Wages. In peacetime we have opposed cost of living adjustments as the sole consideration in wage increases on the further basis that such adjustments do not actually guarantee maintenance of a worker's real wages. The cost of living index is not a crystal ball which tells us infallibly how much it costs to live. It is merely a statistical number, subject to all the errors and pitfalls into which even the most honest statistics must fall. The theory of the cost of living index briefly is this:

A wage-earner's budget is priced in a given period (1935-39 is the period used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) and then that price is called 100 per cent. Increases or decreases from this total price are expressed as percentages of the original total, and the resultant number is called the cost of living index. This method works fairly well as a means of measuring the movements of workers' cost of living as long as buying habits remain constant. However, extremely rapid price changes such as we have had in the last two years will cause marked changes in the buying habits of workers. Changes in supply of the goods and services which workers normally buy will likewise cause a change in buying habits. This upsets the whole foundation of the cost of living index and makes it practically worthless as a measure of workers' real wages.

It is true that the cost of living index published by the U. S. Bureau of Labor statistics has been altered to a certain extent in an attempt to reflect recent vast changes in the buying habits of wage earners. However, it has been impossible to make the index reflect the actual change in cost of living. For one thing, it cannot take into account unusual expenses which have added to the real cost of living for millions of workers, such as migration to war centers, higher cost of food when meals are eaten at restaurants, more difficult and expensive transportation because of longer distances to work, etc.

Also, the cost of living index does not reflect enormous increases in costs to workers because of decreased quality in articles of vital consumption. It cannot reflect the hardships on workers which result from shortages of essential foods such as meats, butter, etc. It does not reflect the hardships occasioned by housing shortages. It does not take into account black market and bootleg prices which workers are forced to pay for the goods they need.

With these inherent weaknesses no one can claim the cost of living index is of any value at all as a measure of workers' real wages. The most it can do is give some indication of the movement of prices.

For instance, within the past six months, according to the Bureau of Labor statistics, there has been only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a 2.1 per cent increase in the cost of living in the Los Angeles area. Would a $4.20 increase to a wage of $200 a month compensate for the black market prices which the workers in the Los Angeles area are forced to pay for meat and butter—when they can get them? Certainly not.

Cost of Living Adjustment Does Not Meet Needs of Low-Income Workers. One of the basic criticisms of the Little Steel formula made by the unions is that it gives least consideration to the low-income workers, who are in most need of upward wage adjustments. In this respect there is no difference between the policy advocated by Gil Green and the Little Steel formula itself. A sample of the anomalous result obtained by application of the Little Steel formula is the recent case of the West Coast Airframe plants, in which the Southern California plants received no cost of living increase, although their base pay was lower than the Seattle Boeing plant which received a 4½ cent cost of living increase. Furthermore, it is a well-established fact that the cost of living of the lower-income brackets increases at a more rapid rate than the cost of living index itself, even under normal economic conditions.

Cost of Living Formula Will Not Accomplish Stated Objectives. Green claims that the cost of living adjustment will establish wage stabilization in a workable fashion. As we have pointed out above, there is no rule of thumb or mechanical formula—Little Steel or any other—which will accomplish wage stabilization. A wage policy, to be effective, must be flexible. Every wage case must be considered on its own merits in the light of the whole production and economic program. The message of President Roosevelt on wage stabilization did give the War Labor Board sufficient flexibility for a realistic determination of wage issues.

Green suggests that a cost of living adjustment will be an incentive to the government to perform its job of controlling prices. To those familiar with the policies and methods of the enemies of price control and their influence in O.P.A., it is apparent that a stronger incentive than the one proposed by Green is needed to get those esteemed gentlemen "off the dime" and down to business. If the workers should follow the premise outlined by Green in their approach to price control, we would be faced not with a "creeping" inflation but with a wholesale piercing of prices. It seems to us—and this has not been clearly pointed out by Green—that the unions themselves have a major job to do in enforcement of the price control program, as well as striving for a sound wage policy. It is our responsibility to see that O.P.A. is subject to as much pressure from consumer forces for control of prices as it meets from big business interests which are constantly working for the removal of price control. This is a job requiring tremendous energy and organization, but one which would, if coupled to a sound wage policy, yield more fruitful results in terms of an improved standard of living

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than would a hare-and-tortoise race for cost-of-living wage increases. It seems to us, therefore, that to expend a major portion of our energy in seeking revision of the Little Steel formula, or its conversion to any other cost of living formula, is a tactical error which we cannot afford.

We do not agree with Green's thesis that an automatic cost of living adjustment would break the bottleneck of the War Labor Board, for the simple reason that it would not solve the wage problems of the workers. Even though such adjustments might be handled outside of the board machinery, there would still be a flood of requests for wage increases because the basic problems would not have been solved. Moreover, some kind of governmental machinery would have to be established to check on cost of living wage adjustments because of the tendency on the part of employers to pay illegally high wages for the purpose of pirating labor and checking unionization.

If the unions want to take a truly constructive approach toward improving the machinery of the War Labor Board, they should tackle their wage problems in the manner we have advocated above. They should continue to seek removal of disruptive inequalities in wage rates. They should seek to establish a clear conception of a substandard wage. They should seek to give meaning to the phrase "effective prosecution of the war," which is nominally one of the basic criteria of the board for granting wage increases, but which, except for a few cases, has never been properly utilized by the unions or by the board itself. They should seek establishment and approval by the War Labor Board of incentive wage systems which will help increase production. They should work out labor utilization plans which will guarantee a full week's work to every worker and assure him not only adequate earnings but full participation in the war effort.

While striving for adoption of a sound wage policy, the unions must carry out their equally important job on other fronts of economic stabilization—taxation, price control, rationing, control of excess profits. Above all, they must continue their efforts for establishment of an over-all plan of the nation's war effort.

REPLY BY GILBERT GREEN

COMRADES William and Pauline Young are entirely correct when they say that what is needed is an approach to the wage question "which takes into account not only the factor of economic stabilization but also the vital questions of productivity, workers' morale and efficiency." In their own treatment of wages, however, the factor of economic stabilization plays no role whatsoever.

My article, "Some Problems of Economic Stabilization," in dealing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with wages, limited itself to only one phase of the problem—its relation to economic stabilization and the fight against inflation. I can assure the comrades that this aspect of the problem is not unrelated to both labor productivity and labor morale.

The comrades state that the wage policies as established by the Administration at the time of the pronouncement of the Little Steel wage formula "are flexible enough to provide the framework of a sound wage policy."

What the Comrades Young seem to forget is that when the wage policies of the Administration were enunciated last Fall they constituted but one plank in an economic stabilization and anti-inflation program which promised that there would be no further increases in the cost of living, democratic rationing, a tax program based on the ability to pay and a $25,000-a-year ceiling over personal earnings.

These comrades would be justified in their position *if* this anti-inflation program had really been applied. But it was not, except in respect to wages. The cost of living continued to spiral upward at even a faster pace than previously. Profiteering remained unchecked. A disproportionate tax burden was placed on the backs of those least able to pay through the 5 per cent payroll Victory Tax and the new income tax rates. Rationing was slow in making its appearance and even at this late date is not yet universal and democratic in its application. Wage stabilization tended therefore to become more and more that of wage freezing and even the flexible interpretation of those aspects of the wage policies dealing with substandard wages and inequalities could not make up for the constant rise in the cost of living and the increasing drift toward inflation.

This failure to apply the anti-inflation program of the Administration, for which the defeatists and obstructionists are in the main responsible, caused no end of discontent in the ranks of the workers, impaired productivity and efficiency and created the danger of sharp class battles.

Bearing these developments in mind, I wrote in my March article that the labor movement seeks "a basic solution to the wage problem by all-out rationing and strict price control and by the raising of substandard wages and the removal of wage inequalities. The C.I.O. has fought for these for months. *But unless and until these basic answers are applied forcefully and efficiently the pressure for increased wages corresponding to the increase in the cost of living will continue to mount.*"

And further, "To refuse to adjust wages to the increased cost of living is to make a cynical mockery of the phrase 'economic stabilization'; for there can be no stabilization if ceilings are imposed and enforced on wages alone."

With these views the Comrades Young disagree. They believe that it was a tactical error to support the demands of labor for an upward revision of the Little Steel wage formula. They believe that it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was also incorrect to think in terms of a more flexible cost of living formula which could be adjusted periodically to the rising cost of living. They are in fact opposed to any cost of living formula whatsoever.

In their discussion article they devote considerable space to proving that cost of living indexes are not accurate barometers of real wages. They argue that any attempt to base wages merely on the cost of living is wrong. But in all this the comrades only succeed in knocking down straw men, for these are not the issues.

Yet evidently there is a purpose in the argumentation. What are the comrades out to prove by this line of argument? That labor should put forward *no* wage demands based upon cost of living considerations?

This certainly is not the position of the majority of workers. It is precisely because they do think of wages as also related to the cost of living and profits that they have been so insistent that something be done about the present situation. Furthermore, the workers know that the present Little Steel wage formula is itself a cost of living formula but one which no longer holds for the cost of living today.

If the comrades are consistent in their opposition to cost of living formulas in principle then they should not merely oppose upward revision of the Little Steel formula or its conversion to a more flexible formula but should call for its elimination entirely, replacing it with nothing new. That's the logic of their position, which would let down all barriers to industrial strife and remove even the objective of wage stabilization.

* * *

The hold-the-line Executive Order of the President, issued a few days ago, introduces a new element into the situation and opens up a new opportunity for a basic solution to the problem. This Order points to the grave danger of inflation; declares that prices will henceforth be controlled and some of them rolled back to September, 1942, levels; adopts the system of subsidies as a means of inducing increased production in certain lines without bringing about an increase in prices; prohibits increases in wages except where necessary to correct substandards of living and authorizes reasonable adjustments of wages in cases of promotions, reclassifications, merit increases and incentive wages.

This Order together with the President's veto of the inflationary Bankhead Bill indicates that the Administration intends more vigorously to apply its anti-inflation program. If truly implemented and executed it can become an important turning point in the battle against inflation. It is for this reason that the labor movement—John L. Lewis excepted—has thrown its support to this Order and intends to fight for its realization, but not without certain reservations and trepidations.

The Executive Order in itself does not yet provide the guarantees that the trend toward inflation will be halted. First, the Executive Order must be fought for by the labor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement and by the Administration, for one must not underestimate the defeatist and reactionary forces who are working to bring on inflation with its concomitant of swollen profits, internal dissension and economic chaos—to the end that the country will be unable to wage an offensive war against Hitlerism.

Second, the Executive Order is itself replete with dangerous loopholes which if not plugged rapidly may result in the defeat of its central objective. Let me cite a few examples. The Price Administrator is directed to place ceilings on all commodities "affecting the cost of living." We may ask, what commodities do not affect the cost of living? Does this phrase refer to super-luxury articles purchased by the ultra-rich, or is it one of those loopholes through which prices will continue to mount?

The Executive Order further fails to make clear the intention to roll back *all* prices to September 15, 1942, levels. It says that "some of these can and should" but inserts a loophole as wide as a house with its phrase, "All of these cannot be rolled back." Why not? Especially if government subsidies are to be available for those production units unable to meet increased costs and as inducements for increased production?

Another glaring omission and shortcoming in the Executive Order is the elimination of any consideration of wage inequalities and its tendency to deprive the War Labor Board of its former role. Unless wage inequalities are given consideration and are eliminated, this will have a detrimental effect on workers' morale, efficiency and productivity. Unless the War Labor Board is restored, with its former powers of discretion, there is grave danger that labor will lose confidence in the government's arbitration machinery; for wage decisions will then be made without any labor representation whatsoever, inflation will not be controlled, and labor's standards and the national war morale will be jeopardized.

Furthermore, there is no guarantee as yet that Congress will go along with the President's program. At this moment the opposite is the case. The House Appropriation Committee is out to liquidate the Farm Security Administration, resists giving the Office of Price Administration the appropriation it needs to police price ceilings and apply democratic rationing, seeks to resurrect the inflationary provisions of the Bankhead Bill and still favors the inflationary Pace Bill.

Thus a great responsibility is placed on the labor movement. It must give its full support to the Executive Order while pressing to eliminate its many loopholes and omissions. It certainly must insist that the powers of the War Labor Board not be curbed and that provision be made to treat realistically with the problem of wage inequalities. It must especially throw its full support to the provisions in the Executive Order dealing with incentive wages, guaranteeing that the workers shall receive full remuneration for every increase in productivity. At the same time it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must concentrate its united strength to defeat the reactionary inflationary bloc in Congress.

If prices are controlled; if universal and democratic rationing is instituted; if an equitable tax program is adopted; if profiteering is checked; if substandard wages are raised and gross inequalities eliminated; if the principle of incentive wages is correctly applied; then the pressure in the ranks of labor for general wage increases will subside and the issue of difference between the Comrades Young on the one hand and myself on the other will become entirely academic.

If, however, the Executive Order and the struggle of labor for its application do not stop the drift toward inflation, then come hell or high water there is no power that will be able to keep the workers from demanding in ever more emphatic terms that the Little Steel wage formula be revised or converted to one of a more flexible character, giving to them an increase in wages corresponding to the increase in the cost of living.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW STAGE IN THE FIGHT TO ABOLISH THE POLL-TAX

BY THEODORE R. BASSETT

THE semi-feudalistic poll-tax disfranchises ten million Americans, six million whites, and four million Negroes in seven Southern states. But its abolition is not the issue of the Southern people alone. It is an urgent issue for all Americans North and South. Passage of H.R. 7, the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill, is the vital concern of the entire American people, because the speedy wiping out of the poll tax in this session of Congress is a win-the-war necessity. Repeal of the poll tax will strengthen national unity, will enhance America's power in the United Nations, and will contribute to speeding the destruction of the Hitler Axis.

Why is the immediate repeal of the poll tax a win-the-war necessity? Because the reactionary Southern poll-tax bloc controls a majority of key Congressional committees and, with an effectively disfranchised electorate, uses this power to obstruct vital win-the-war measures.

Working hand in glove with the reactionary coalition of Hoover Republicans and Wheeler Democrats, the Southern poll-tax bloc, from positions of power, not only exercises a pro-fascist minority veto over vital win-the-war measures, but is now engaged, together with these defeatists, in a most brazen reactionary offensive against the nation's war program.

The Copperheads and defeatists are active in every phase of our social and political life. But all their obstructionist activity comes to a head in Congress. They have succeeded in delaying the opening of the Second Front in Western Europe. They are now energetically trying to create confusion, aggravate class frictions and internal strife purposely to destroy government - labor - industry collaboration and national unity, wreck the war effort, and thus pave the way for a negotiated peace with the Axis.

The Southern poll-tax Bourbons base themselves on their reactionary class interests, for the maintenance of their special status quo. They fear that their reactionary political positions and the backward, semi-feudal socio-economic structure in the South will be wiped out in the course of this progressive war. Hence, their organized defeatism. The very idea of the Four Free-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doms and the Atlantic Charter is anathema to them.

* * *

There are sixty-nine Representatives and fourteen Senators from the seven poll-tax states, Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. There are also ten elected Representatives and two Senators from Tennessee which abolished the poll tax in February of this year. The poll-taxers hold the controlling chairmanships of eleven out of thirty-three standing committees of the Senate, including such key committees as Foreign Relations, headed by Tom Connally of Texas; Rules, by Harry Flood Byrd of Virginia; Appropriations, by Carter Glass of Virginia; Agriculture, by Ellison D. Smith of South Carolina; Finance, by Walter F. George of Georgia; and Immigration, by Richard B. Russell of Georgia. In the House the poll-taxers hold the controlling chairmanships of seventeen of the forty-seven standing committees, including such key committees as Judiciary, chaired by Hatton W. Sumners of Texas; Naval Affairs, by Carl Vinson of Georgia; Agriculture, by Hampton P. Fulmer of South Carolina; Banking and Currency, by Henry B. Steagall of Alabama; Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by Schuyler Otis Bland of Virginia; Civil Service, by Robert Ramspeck of Georgia; and Rivers and Harbors, by Joseph P. Mansfield of Texas.

The poll-taxers hold second ranking Democratic positions on seven other standing committees in the Senate and eleven in the House. This includes such key committees in the House as Appropriations, Rules, Foreign Affairs and Military Affairs. The poll-taxers gain these controlling positions by seniority. With the masses effectively excluded from the ballot by the poll tax, the "representatives" are returned to Congress, election after election, by corrupt political machines.

* * *

At the very moment when Congress should have been taking steps to carry out the people's will for vigorous prosecution of the war, at the very moment when the glorious offensive of the Red Army presented the U.S.A. and Great Britain with the opportunity of *speeding* up the destruction of Hitler Germany through the opening of the large-scale military offensive in Western Europe, the defeatist forces put over in Congress a first-rate victory for Hitler. The House endorsed the poll-tax Congressman Martin Dies, 302-94.

Martin Dies *is* "The American most frequently quoted by the Axis Radio," says *Newsweek*, in January, 1942. Likewise, the *New York Herald Tribune*, prior to the House vote on the resolution to continue the Dies Committee, urged that an end be made to this "play into Hitler's hands."

The white supremacy poll-tax system gave us Martin Dies, aptly called by Earl Browder "our American Fifth Columnist Extraordinary."

It was Representative E. E. Cox

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of poll-tax Georgia who introduced the resolution to extend the life of the Dies Committee.

The poll-taxers yield also a high quota of professional labor-baiters, such as Representatives Sam Hobbs of Alabama, Howard Smith of Virginia, E. E. Cox and Carl Vinson of Georgia, John Rankin of Mississippi, as well as Senator Lee W. O'Daniel of Texas. These labor-baiters are actively engaged in attacks on labor in the present reactionary drive against the war effort in Congress.

A whole series of defeatist measures constituting a serious danger to the national unity and the war effort has the solid backing of the poll-tax bloc, demagogic measures typified by the Hobbs "anti-racketeering" bill, the Johnson "Work or Fight Bill," the Byrd Bill to draft strikers, and the Connally Bill to seize plants on strike.

The Congressional Farm Bloc, which represents the interests of the large cotton planters and commercial farmers, and which has successfully obstructed even the partial steps toward the all-out conversion of agriculture, is headed by poll-tax Representatives Steagall and Hobbs and poll-tax Senators Bankhead of Alabama and "Cotton Ed" Smith of South Carolina.

Victory food production, which demands the conversion of cotton plantations to food and livestock centers, is bitterly opposed by the Bourbon planters, and their poll-tax representatives. One third of the nation's farm labor is in non-essential crops, such as cotton and tobacco. The Farm Bloc is determined to keep it so.

The poll-tax-led Farm Bloc has also succeeded in slashing the $65,000,000 farm labor appropriation to $26,000,000, and in transferring the supervision of the program from the Farm Security Administration to the Department of Agriculture extension service controlled by the Farm Bloc, thus seriously impeding the efforts to increase the productivity of the small farmers necessary to the Victory Food Program.

The poll-tax-led Farm Bloc put through the Senate and House the Bankhead Bill which would boost prices seven per cent. In vetoing that pernicious bill, President Roosevelt correctly declared it "inflationary in character," stating that "It will make the winning of the war more difficult and gravely imperil the peace."

The obstructionist activity of the poll-taxers is further evidenced in the aggressive role they have played in the attacks of the defeatist camp on the O.P.A., on the $25,000 salary limitation order of President Roosevelt, on the F.E.P.C., on the extension of the franchise to the soldiers, sailors and marines, on the project for emergency care for the children of soldiers whose wives are employed in war industry; in the hamstringing investigation of Government agencies such as the F.S.A., the Smith Resolution to investigate the conduct of the war; in the withholding of funds from the War Manpower Commission; in scrapping Administration plans to increase corporation and profit taxes; in bringing forward the Bankhead bill, to use soldiers on the cotton plantation; and in a number of other instances which could be cited.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Congressional poll-taxers are doing their utmost to carry out the "divide and conquer" tactics of Hitler. Particularly notorious in this regard is the racist Representative John Rankin of Mississippi, arch Negro-baiter, anti-Semite, and Soviet-hater.

Through the Negro discriminations and disabilities which the poll-taxers foster and impose on the production front and in the armed forces, they hamper the war effort, and undermine the civilian and army morale.

Through their slanderous anti-Negro rantings, designed to demoralize the 13,000,000 Negro people, and to destroy national unity, they foment inter-racial strife and thereby furnish propaganda for a fascist fifth column which is known to be working feverishly among the millions of colored people of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Further, the disfranchisement of 10,000,000 Americans through the poll tax weakens United Nations' unity and brings into question among the darker peoples of India, China and Latin America the sincerity of America's and the United Nations' aims. Its passage is necessary to heighten the morale of the American people, to achieve the full integration of the Negro people in the national unity and to deprive the fascist demagogues of any basis for pointing the finger of scorn against the U.S.A.

The fight to abolish the poll tax system is a fight for national unity, a fight for victory.

* * *

The poll tax came into being in its present form during the last decade of the 19th Century, when American industrial capitalism was being transformed into imperialism. Prior to the beginning of the Civil War, the poll tax, which served historically as a transition from property qualifications to free suffrage, had been abolished in all but six states, two in the South and four in the North. The disfranchisement movement which swept the South beginning with the 90's of the last century was the answer of Northern reaction and the Southern bourbons to the growing unity of the Negro and white masses as exemplified in the Populist movement. It was the definite means of the Bourbons for checking the people's movement, arresting this unity and giving "legal" form to existing Negro repression.

When Carter Glass, Senior Senator from Virginia, one of the moving lights in the establishment of the poll taxes and the lily-white constitutions, was asked at the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1901-02 whether the poll tax was not excluding the Negroes from the ballot by fraud, he answered: "By fraud, no; by discrimination, yes. But it will be discrimination within the letter of the law. Discrimination! Why, that is precisely what we propose. . . ."*

The object of the poll tax, to restrict the electorate through disfranchisement, has been achieved. In the 1940 elections only 30.7 per cent of the potential voters went to

---

* *Reports of the Proceeding and Debates of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Virginia, June 12, 1901-June 26, 1902*, Richmond, 1906. Vol. II, p. 3076.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the polls in Tennessee, 28.1 in Texas, 22.1 in Virginia, 18.9 in Alabama, 18.4 in Arkansas, 17.7 in Georgia, 14.2 in Mississippi, and 10.1 in South Carolina. Compare this with 82.2 per cent in Illinois, 70.6 in New York, 73.3 in California, non-poll tax states.

The tax is cumulative in four of the seven poll-tax states. All back taxes, including interest and late assessment charges, must be paid by the voter; in Georgia, the tax, $1.50 per year, can, in its cumulative state, be as high as $47.47.

Two recent studies by the National Resources Committee of the Federal Government showed that in 1935-6, not including families on relief, 41.5 per cent of all families in the South had cash incomes of under $750 per year, and 53.1 per cent of Negro families had incomes under $500; and that 46.5 per cent of wage-earning families and 47.9 per cent of farm families had incomes below solvency requirements. The poll tax thus effectively disfranchises the broad masses of the Southern people.

The poll tax, though the chief, is not the only disfranchising mechanism. There are lily-white primaries, literacy tests, grandfather clauses, and downright intimidation and terror directed against the Negro people. The fight to repeal the poll tax will further strengthen the progressive forces necessary to sweep away the remaining special obstacles standing in the way of the exercise of the francise by the Negroes.

* * *

The Geyer Anti-Poll Tax Bill, H.R. 1024, was introduced by the late Lee E. Geyer, Democrat of California, on January 3, 1941. It was brought out of the House Judiciary Committee headed by Poll Taxer Hatton Sumners of Texas on the floor of the House for vote on September, 1942, only by the signatures of 218 Congressmen on a discharge petition, following a long campaign. The poll-tax-dominated house Judiciary Committee had bottled up the Geyer Anti-Poll Tax Bill since August 5, 1939, when it was first introduced on behalf of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Its companion bill in the Senate, the Pepper Bill, was released by the Senate Judiciary Committee on October 26, 1942, after 19 months of stalling and only after a considerable campaign had reversed the unfavorable decision of a sub-committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The Pepper-Geyer Anti-Poll Tax Bill was killed on November 23 by a vote of 41-37 on a motion to invoke cloture, *i.e.*, shut off debate and bring the bill to a vote.

The success of the filibusterers has to be explained first of all by their coalition with the Northern Republican defeatists.

Senator Charles F. McNary, Republican minority leader, joined hands with the poll-tax bloc to knife the anti-poll tax bill.

Under McNary's guidance, the Senate Republicans pretended to be for the Bill but only against cloture.

In the scandalous filibuster of the Geyer-Pepper Anti-Poll Tax Bill the Southern poll-taxers, allied with the Hoover Republicans

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Wheeler Democrats, met on the common ground of highhanded obstruction of the war effort.

The vote for cloture was in reality the vote on the bill, since a two-thirds vote for cloture was the only way to smash the filibuster and bring the bill to a vote. A majority of the Senators had pledged to vote for the bill.

The Administration brought forward the Geyer-Pepper Bill and fought for it. But its failure to take a more forthright and consistent stand undoubtedly caused half-heartedness and defection among its supporters. The Administration shares a big responsibility for its defeat. Failure of the poll-tax fight has boomeranged against the win-the-war forces.

* * *

Emboldened by their victory in the filibuster, the poll taxers launched a brazen offensive against President Roosevelt and the Administration leaders. In their present reactionary stampede, they are proceeding to intimidate, with no inconsiderable success, many of their fellow-Democrats, supporters of the Administration.

In this regard an all-out struggle against the Southern poll-tax wing of the Democratic Party as a powerful pillar of the defeatist edifice is indispensable to the strengthening of national unity and the progressive win-the-war political realignment of the country. The Democratic Party is the ruling administration party and pivot for the broadest national unity, for the working collaboration of labor, the Roosevelt Democrats, the Willkie Republicans, and all win-the-war forces. But the Democratic Party cannot become the instrument for the broadest national unity, if it makes concessions to the obstructionist activity of its powerful Southern reactionary wing and the Wheeler Democrats.

National unity cannot be built, preserved or strengthened by evading or glossing over differences in relation to basic win-the-war measures. National unity can be built and maintained only by struggle against, and not in unity with, defeatists.

* * *

The most important shortcomings of the anti-poll tax campaign last year were:

1. The failure to present the poll-tax issue convincingly enough as a key win-the-war issue; to point out its relation to production in the South; and to stress sufficiently the scope of the disfranchisement of broad strata of the Southern people, especially the whites, who are affected in greater number than the Negroes.

2. The Negro people were not sufficiently involved. There was a lack of unity of the Negro forces as well as poor timing of their efforts.

3. The developing coalition of labor, the farmers, Roosevelt Democrats, Willkie Republicans, and the Negroes was weak and too late to smash the filibuster. Southern labor and progressive organizations were active, yet one of the most serious

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weaknesses of the campaign was the absence of effective pressure from the South, especially by Southern whites.

4. The House campaign was allowed to drag, giving the strategical advantage to the Senate filibusterers.

5. The slogan "a vote against cloture is a vote against the anti-poll tax bill" was not sufficiently popularized.

* * *

A particularly significant and encouraging development in the fight to wipe out the poll tax in the first session of the 78th Congress was the formation of a coalition of six Congressmen for the purpose of securing the speedy passage of H.R. 7, the anti-poll tax bill introduced by Representative Marcantonio on January 6.

The members of this group are George E. Bender, Republican, of Ohio, chairman; Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington; Vito Marcantonio, American Laborite, of New York; Joseph A. Gavagan, Democrat, of New York; William L. Dawson, Democrat, of Illinois, the only Negro member of Congress; and Joseph Clark Baldwin, Republican of New York. Congressman Magnuson will control the bill on the floor of the House for the Democrats, and Congressman Baldwin for the Republicans.

This coalition includes five of the six representatives who introduced anti-poll tax bills in the opening days of the present session of Congress.

Announcing the formation of the steering committee the six Congressmen declared:

"This has been done in an effort to secure speedy passage of this important win-the-war legislation in the first session of the present Congress. . . .

"It is our desire that this measure, which has received the support of broad sections of the American people and which is endorsed by members of Congress in all political parties, shall not become a narrowly partisan measure." (*The Poll Tax Repealer*, March, 1943.)

The formation of this coalition will accelerate the passage of this vital win-the-war legislation. It assures unity in the House around one anti-poll tax bill, H.R. 7. It eliminates competition and makes it more difficult for politics-as-usual and defeatist elements to make game out of the people's desire for anti-poll tax legislation. It will help put boldness into the less resolute elements of win-the-war forces. It lays a base for a wide coalition of Democrats and Republicans behind the bill.

Working jointly with the Congressional anti-poll tax coalition is the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax, at whose National Working Conference on March 9-10, in Washington, the formation of the coalition was announced. Over one hundred delegates, representing labor, the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and the Railroad Brotherhoods, civic, religious, Negro, and farmer organizations, attended this working conference of the committee, where a drive was launched to repeal the poll tax in this session of Congress.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other events denoting this renewed struggle are the recent defeat of the poll tax in Tennessee, the re-introduction of an anti-poll tax bill in the legislature of Georgia; the support of poll-tax abolition as a principal demand of the Southern War Labor Conference of the A. F. of L., held on January 16-17 at Atlanta, Georgia; the adoption of resolutions by a number of State legislative conferences; and the memorializing of Congress by a number of State legislatures and city councils for the passage of Federal anti-poll tax legislation.

* * *

The Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill, H.R. 7, around which unity has been achieved by all those now actively fighting the poll tax, is now bottled up in the House Judiciary Committee, headed by poll-taxer Hatton Sumners of Texas. The first step in the fight for anti-poll tax legislation in the first session of the present Congress is the speedy securing of the needed 218 signatures to the jointly sponsored discharge petition known as House Petition No. 3, in order to bring H.R. 7 up for vote. At this writing, 41 signatures are still needed. They should be secured as quickly as possible. The non-partisan steering committee around the Marcantonio Anti-Poll Tax Bill should be enlarged.

It is imperative that the following steps be taken in connection with the current campaign:

The existing unity on a national scale of the A. F. of L., C.I.O., the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the National Farmers' Union should be brought down into the ranks. Labor must exert its initiative for the organization of a unified campaign in each state of the trade unions, the farmers, the Willkie Republicans, Roosevelt Democrats, the Negro people and all patriotic forces. This campaign should be organized in the most flexible fashion, as may be required by the status of the movement in each region, state or locality. A model of organization in this connection is the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.

The specific task of these regional, state and local movements should be:

1. To organize a campaign of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and delegations to local Congressmen urging them to sign House Discharge Petition number 3 at once, to join the Non-Partisan Anti-Poll Tax Bill Steering Committee, and to vote for H.R. 7.

2. To get State Legislatures still in session and municipal bodies to pass resolutions memorializing Congress to pass H.R. 7.

3. To organize delegations to Senators and all state and public officials, including governors and mayors, municipal officials, and state chairmen of all political party organizations, demanding that they publicly speak out for the passage of H.R. 7 and Federal anti-poll tax legislation in the Senate. Pledges to vote against cloture should be obtained from Senators now.

4. To promote the writing of letters to President Roosevelt, urging him to give firm leadership for the immediate passage of H.R. 7 in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

House and a companion measure in the Senate as a vital win-the-war measure.

5. To promote the distribution of anti-poll tax literature in every organization of labor and the people, in neighborhood, fraternal, religious, political, and civic bodies, securing the adoption of resolutions, involving every individual in the campaign continuously through letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and delegations to be directed wherever they may be required from time to time.

* * *

The Communist Party has played an important part in the development of the 1943 campaign for the repeal of the poll tax. It has consistently argued and fought for the abolition of the white supremacy poll-tax system. The party, under the leadership of Earl Browder, has pointed out how the poll-tax system has its roots in the disgraceful national oppression of the Negro people, and has fought for Negro rights as essential to the breakup of the semi-feudal South.

This activity of the Communist Party has consistently been evidenced in the fight for the freedom of the Scottsboro boys and of Angelo Herndon, in the struggle for jobs and for abolition of Jim-Crow bars in the trade unions, in its long fight for Federal anti-poll tax and anti-lynch legislation, and in its struggle to wipe out Jim-Crow practices now as essential to winning the war. Thus, the party has struck at the very heart of the white supremacy poll-tax system so inimical to our war effort today. This has constituted a great contribution toward the strengthening of national unity.

In the spirit of this pioneering tradition, the Communists and the Left and progressive forces within the trade unions must rally all the win-the-war forces, and in the first place labor itself, for the timely fulfillment of this urgent win-the-war task, the immediate repeal of the poll tax.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOMAS E. DEWEY: HIS RECORD

BY S. W. GERSON

POSSESSING more than one-tenth the nation's population and electing more than 10 per cent of the House of Representatives, New York is obviously a politically crucial state. The largest manufacturing and second largest dairy state in the Union, and the nation's financial and cultural center, it has the largest labor movement of the country. As the home state of President Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, it demands close political scrutiny.

But the fact that New York for the first time in a generation has a Republican Governor, in the person of Thomas E. Dewey, gives the state's politics an especial importance and makes the political character of its Chief Executive a legitimate object of political attention, particularly when it is recalled that he is an avowed candidate for the Presidency.

What are Dewey's policies on fundamental international and national questions? What is his record on state legislation? What light does his record shed on his basic views, the social forces he represents and the political groups with which he is allied?

* * *

A protegé of former U. S. Attorney George Z. Medalie and an assistant U. S. Attorney in the Hoover Administration, Dewey was catapulted to gang-busting fame by a more-than-helpful press after he was named a special prosecutor by Gov. Herbert Lehman in 1935. Much of his reputation derives from activity in certain service unions which were cleaned up with the active cooperation of progressive unionists who had spent risky years fighting the mobsters. The latter question, however, Dewey rarely discusses.

In 1937 the 35-year-old Dewey was elected District Attorney on the Republican-Fusion-American Labor Party slate. Hardly had he taken office in 1938 when he began to cast covetous eyes at the Governor's Mansion in Albany. It was at that time that Hearst began to boost Dewey, writing:

"The election of Dewey is a national issue . . . that will be accepted in every state of the country as a rebuke of government blundering of the Treasury . . . unsound legislation, radicalism, Communism. . . ." (*New York Evening Journal*, Nov. 3, 1938)

The 1938 gubernatorial race is now history. Dewey ran consid-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erably ahead of Governor Lehman on the Democratic ticket, but was unable to win since Lehman also had the American Labor Party nomination. The combination was enough to nose out Dewey by 64,349 votes. (Lehman would not have received that margin had not the Communist candidate, Israel Amter, withdrawn in his favor. Amter, running for Representative-at-Large, received 105,681 votes.)

In 1939, Dewey began his campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination. On July 7 the Hearst papers from coast to coast carried a full-page editorial booming him. The very next day Dewey's "advisers" announced the start of a nationwide drive to win the Presidential nomination. The same day the Scripps-Howard press said that Dewey "will deal largely with economy, a subject on which he feels most deeply. . . . His hardest task just now is to satisfy both Alf M. Landon and Herbert Hoover."

* * *

Bidding for the Republican nomination, Dewey had persistently thrummed the anti-Roosevelt lyre, attacking the New Deal as the "mess that's been made in the last seven years." (New York *Times*, Dec. 10, 1939.) At one point he asked:

"Are your children and mine going to be free men or are they being sold into the bondage of debt by an irresponsible and spendthrift administration?" (New York *Times*, Jan. 24, 1940.)

A month later he assailed the New Deal on the ground that "it has erected a bureaucracy of so-called administrators who have harassed and bedeviled every field of enterprise." (New York *Times*, Feb. 13, 1940.)

While never as outspoken as Senators Wheeler and Vandenberg and Rep. Martin Dies, he gave considerable support to their views, urging the "avoidance of foreign entanglements" and demanding the elimination from public life of "Socialists, Communists and fellow travelers." (New York *Times*, May 28, 1940.)

Possibly Dewey's most rounded-out opinion on foreign affairs was given in a speech before a group of Republican women in New York on January 20, 1940, when he had the following to say concerning the Soviet Union:

"It has recently been revealed that within the past year the administration seriously considered still another deal with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In a futile attempt to avert war, it actually explored the possibilities of a fantastic partnership with Russia. . . . I think our administration will stop trying to make deals with Russia . . . we need no such partnerships. With the world as it is today, we can afford no more fuzzy-minded departures from the established course of our foreign policy." (New York *Herald Tribune*, Jan. 21, 1940.

Not only did Dewey put himself on record at that time as opposed to the "partnership with Russia," which is today our established national policy and upon which our national security depends, but he

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

went far beyond that by attacking recognition of the Soviet Union:

"Insofar as the present administration has adhered to the policies of its predecessors, it has met with the general approval of the American people, but it has occasionally strayed from the path. A conspicuous and most unfortunate departure was the recognition by the New Deal of Soviet Russia." (*Ibid.*)

In the same speech Dewey attacked the Soviet Union in made-in-Berlin terminology, declaring that the great Soviet government had "achieved power by assassination" and terming it "a perversion of government abhorrent to the conscience of mankind." (*Ibid.*)

In the absence of any other important statement, that speech must remain on the record as Mr. Dewey's definite views on America's relationship with our great Soviet Ally.

* * *

Dewey as Governor, with a subservient Legislature, four years of power ahead of him and millions of dollars' worth of patronage, may or may not be the Republican Presidential candidate in 1944. However, he is apparently making every effort to control the New York convention delegation of about 115, approximately one-fifth the number necessary to nominate the candidate. His current speeches and acts therefore are some forecast of the line he will adopt at the G.O.P. convention.

Dewey's most important programmatic speeches—his inaugural address, his opening message to the Legislature and those at other forums—are significant in their omissions as well as their specific declarations. All show lip service to the war effort, but significantly avoid mention of the words fascism, the Axis, Hitler, etc. In no speech has he referred to the United Nations or the concepts inherent in this coalition. He has studiously ignored the necessity for an offensive in Europe. In short, he has said nothing that might offend appeasers like Vandenberg, Taft, Wheeler and Nye. Politically shifty, his public addresses bear out Earl Browder's pithy description of the man:

"Thomas E. Dewey represents the Hoover-Landon forces, but maneuvers to avoid the sharp issues in the struggle against Willkie and the national unity forces." (*Victory—and After*, International Publishers, pp. 120-121.)

The central thoughts of Dewey's speeches are the slogans of so-called "free enterprise," the chief slogan of Herbert Hoover and the National Association of Manufacturers, and that shibboleth of reactionary poll-taxers, "states' rights." The danger to the system of free enterprise, according to Dewey, comes not from Berlin but from Washington. His attacks, in carefully veiled phrases, have been consistently leveled, not only at Washington's present policies, but on the post-war ideas put forth by Henry Wallace. There is a significant basic identity between Dewey's views and those put forth by William Witherow, N.A.M. National President.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In his message to the Legislature on January 6, Dewey said:

". . . We must not fall into the error of assuming that public works are a substitute for the enterprise of a free society. They are merely one aspect of the total productive effort. Except in a totalitarian society, public works can never be more than a small percentage of the activity of a nation. We must make sure that we make our plans in every respect for the free society for which we are fighting."

The similarity to Witherow's line can be seen in the following newspaper dispatch from Chicago:

"William P. Witherow, Chairman of the Board of National Association of Manufacturers, pledged the wholehearted cooperation of industry in rebuilding a homeless and hungry post-war world—but under the banner of free enterprise." (New York *Herald Tribune*, Jan. 14, 1943.)

While Dewey's main strength has come in the past from the farm areas and the city middle classes, he is clearly going beyond these groups and is attempting to win over a section of the labor movement. His message to the Legislature contained a deceptive appeal to the trade union movement, which upon examination is revealed as fundamentally anti-labor. He said then:

"Organized labor faces a difficult crisis in our country today. In large measure the forms of free collective bargaining have been superseded by regulations governing hours, wages and conditions of employment promulgated by the federal government. . . . For the time being labor unions are finding their whole purpose virtually regulated out of existence. The process we are witnessing with our own eyes, here at home, demonstrates the fundamental truth that there is no place for genuine collective bargaining in a regulated economy. That is true because collective bargaining is a right of free labor and there can be no free labor except in a free economy. . . ."

Reports were current that this section of Dewey's speech was approved by some state A. F. of L. leaders. Whether approved or not, the fact is that Dewey's thinly veiled attack on the Roosevelt Administration and his crocodile tears over organized labor's new difficulties are a crafty attempt to utilize the grievances and ineptitude of certain ultra-conservative elements in the A. F. of L. leadership. Some A. F. of L. leaders, unable to adjust themselves to the new forms of union activity required by the war situation, are undoubtedly hostile to various federal regulations. The Woll-Hutcheson forces, steeped in craft union partisanship, have been leaning toward revision, if not total destruction of the Wagner Act. Dewey is evidently seeking political alliance with some of these groups.

In this sly passage, Dewey attempts three things: firstly, to convey the argument that the Federal government is responsible for onerous regulations harmful to labor; secondly, that trade unions have no genuine functions today; and thirdly, that trade unionism can exist only under a Hooverite type of "free" economy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The attack on the Federal administration's war labor policies—agreed to in the interests of a people's war by the overwhelming majority of organized labor—was leveled in the same speech with the statement: "The hard-won rights of labor which have been abridged by war-time controls . . . must be restored intact. . . ." This is obviously a blow aimed at the whole body of war-time regulation that has developed by the collaboration between New Deal administrators and the labor movement. To wreck these controls would be to sharpen relations between labor and management in the period of the war and thus to harm the war effort.

Dewey's assault on trade unionism as such is hardly less subtle. In the same speech he said: "For the time being labor unions are finding their whole purpose virtually regulated out of existence." This is a fine weapon against C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions seeking to organize the unorganized, especially in the war industries. If labor unions have no functions, employers may well argue, quoting Governor Dewey as their authority, why should any worker vote for a union and pay dues to a union?

More basic, perhaps, is Dewey's crafty attempt to hitch trade unionism to the Hoover "free economy" wagon. Under the concept advanced by Dewey, a free trade union movement can exist only in the N.A.M.-blessed utopia of "free enterprise," where only an insignificant minimum of public works exist and such enterprises as state public housing vanish. This position finds its demagogic counterpart in John L. Lewis' recent attacks on the reports of the National Resources Planning Board for an American Beveridge Plan. Moved by the same basic anti-New Deal impulses, Dewey and Lewis inevitably come to occupy the same fundamental Hooverite position.

The "free enterprise" theme—the theme of a finance capital untrammeled by any powerful central and liberal regulation—is paralleled in Dewey's public declarations by the equally reactionary concept of states' rights, so sharply put by him in his address to the regional meeting of the Council of State Governors, in New York, April 9. It was in this speech that Dewey developed full-blown the theory that the principal enemy of our liberties is the Federal government and that the main task before the people is to restore popular sovereignty to the various states. It was in this speech that he declared that this was not only a future problem, but a question of "the most efficient way to win the war."

"Shall we permit the continuance of the totalitarian trend in our own country?" he asked rhetorically. Implying clearly that the Roosevelt war government, leading a nation fighting for its life, was removed from the people, he asked, "whether we shall again bring government close to the people. Shall they make their own decisions as robust, clear-thinking free men or shall they abandon their rights to an aggressive oligarchy at the seat of national government?"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Obviously this is the old Hoover-Landon line, so dear to the hearts of the G.O.P. Old Guard. Its practical domestic significance, of course, is its affinity to the political philosophy of the Bourbon Southern Democrats (as well as the Northern Farley Democrats). Its sinister meaning for the war, with the iron necessity for strong centralized administration, is self-evident.

* * *

Briefly, then, it can be said that Deweyism *is* Hooverism. But it would be a mistake to imagine that Dewey's policy is the clear, crass, naked Hooverism of yore. Dewey is highly conscious of the powerful New Deal sentiment in New York State, the nearly half-million voters who support the American Labor Party and the Communist Party, the strong trade union movement, the prestige of his fellow New Yorkers, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie, and the influence exerted in his own party by the ideas of Willkie. That accounts for a certain slippery evasiveness in respect to large social questions, and an emphasis on apparently structural questions which conceal fundamental social problems. Thus, for example, Dewey poses the theory of states' rights versus over-centralization, when in fact he means to pose the question of the unshackled rule of reactionary monopoly capital versus the policies of a liberal capitalist Washington administration.

In his administrative activities as Governor, Dewey has sought to concentrate attention on slogans like "economy," "efficiency," "streamlining," "clearing out the cobwebs," and has begun a series of investigations of workmen's compensation and the state's mental hygiene institutions. He prides himself on his "business-like" approach to state fiscal matters and thumps the tub on his prudence in the anticipated surplus of $70,000,000—most of it a heritage from Lehman administrations. In making appointments he has publicly stressed the necessity for "clean" men and has had state police investigate would-be officeholders. Undoubtedly he created some animosities in the Republican organization by making personal appointments without regard for the county machine leaders. However, he is by no means the reformer in these matters that some might believe. While undoubtedly appointing technically competent men to the higher offices—and men whose loyalty is first of all to Boss Dewey rather than to the G.O.P. as such—he is a cold machine man in respect to the lesser offices which he is filling with party wheel-horses, even "creating" jobs for some G.O.P. hacks.

Experience with New York's progressive electorate has tempered the fundamentally Hooverite policy of Dewey with considerable caution. It must be recorded that of the 3,732 bills and resolutions introduced into the Dewey-dominated State Legislature, virtually none could be construed as directly anti-labor, in sharp contrast with the raft of anti-labor bills introduced in the California and Ohio state legislatures,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also Republican-controlled. On the contrary, Dewey and his advisers thought it better to make certain concessions to the organized labor movement, *e.g.*, a $2,500,000 appropriation for child care centers, a raise for civil service wage-earners, etc.

Such attacks on social legislation that have been made were of the tricky, chiseling, flank-attack sort. Such, for example, was the passage of the Hampton Housing Redevelopment Bill, which granted huge tax concessions to insurance companies to enter into the private housing field, and the failure to enact a $35,000,000 public housing bill.

A move interpreted by all organized labor as hostile was the invitation to Rickenbacker to address a joint session of the Legislature on Washington's Birthday. The aroused labor movement compelled the Democratic minority to attack Rickenbacker and forced the Repubican majority to disassociate itself from Rickenbacker's position. Dewey himself felt it convenient to leave Albany prior to the ceremonies.

If Dewey and the Republican administration had planned to introduce anti-labor legislation, they quickly disabused themselves of such notions after labor's hot reception to Rickenbacker. On the contrary, there is reason to believe that Dewey is seeking to cultivate certain sections of labor by means more concrete than political philosophy. The President of the Rochester Central Trades Council, A. F. of L., was given an important appointment and there is understood to be contact between the Right-wing American Labor Party leadership and the Dewey forces. The appointment of I.L.G.W.U. President David Dubinsky to a committee by Dewey a week after election day is, of course, not without its significance.

Most of the Dewey program legislation enacted, with the exception of the child care and the wage raise bills, was primarily structural in character: changes in the income tax law, reapportionment, etc. Anti-discrimination legislation, with the exception of one bill, was buried, and George Burrows, a Mississippi Negro worker, was sent back to Mississippi lynch justice despite vigorous demands from progressive trade union and Negro circles that Dewey refuse to sign extradition papers. The protests had the by-product, however, of winning the green light for unanimous passage of a resolution memorializing Congress to pass H.R. 7, Representative Vito Marcantonio's anti-poll tax bill. With a careful eye on the record, Dewey had the Legislature adopt a watery resolution supporting "an international organization of all nations" and a resolution greeting the Red Army on its 25th anniversary.

The notorious Rapp-Coudert Committee, allegedly investigating subversive activities in the schools and headed by a legal representative of the Vichy regime, State Senator Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., was continued by the Dewey-controlled Legislature and given an additional $115,000. Here there was

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no conflict between the Legislature and the executive, as was true in previous years. Dewey had the power to kill the committee. He apparently preferred not to, thus indicating his political agreement with the policies and methods of a committee whose activities parallel that of the un-American Dies Committee.

* * *

It cannot yet be said that organized labor in New York or nationally has made a rounded-out estimate of Mr. Dewey. President Daniel Tobin of the Teamsters Union in a recent issue of his union *Journal* incorrectly bracketed Dewey as a "progressive" Republican along with Governors Stassen and Saltonstall. In New York, State Federation of Labor President Thomas J. Lyons and Secretary-Treasurer E. W. Edwards were more cautious, declaring at the end of the session that they "appreciated the lack of any hostile or anti-labor legislation." (Statement issued March 27, 1943.)

These are obviously short-term judgments. Time and more careful scrutiny will undoubtedly disclose to wide sections of labor the fundamental Hooverite content under the "progressive" protective coloration of Deweyism. There will be revealed an agile representative of those forces in the nation, and especially of the reactionary wing of the Republican Party, who oppose the policies upon which our country's fate and future security depend: a coalition war of the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union and the invasion of Europe while Hitler is reeling under the powerful blows struck by the Red Army on the Eastern Front; the unity and the collaboration of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain and China to win the war to destroy Nazism-fascism, and to guarantee a just and durable peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNDER A "SOCIALIST" MANTLE

BY MAX STEINBERG

THE New York press of February 8, 1943, carried a news item announcing the formation of an "American Labor Conference on International Affairs" with William Green, President of the A. F. of L., as chairman; David Dubinsky, President of the International Ladies Garment Workers, as Vice-Chairman; and a membership including other leaders of the A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Railway Brotherhoods, as well as a number of American and European intellectuals. According to the press announcement, the purpose of this "Labor Conference," will be to formulate policies on which American and European labor can agree. The news item explained that the new organization would seek to draw in additional American experts—European scholars and labor "representatives" of the occupied countries now residing in the United States.

The newly founded group was undoubtedly accepted casually by the general public as one of the innumerable committees for post-war studies. Many people, unacquainted with the problems of the international labor movement, may even have greeted the formation of such a conference as very timely, since it is clear that labor must assume ever greater responsibility in the present war situation and must exert due influence in the coming peace. But those who anticipate constructive efforts on the part of this newly formed "Labor Conference" are bound to be bitterly disappointed. For, behind the formation of this new organization lies a sinister intrigue, aimed at disrupting the unity of the labor movement, both here and on a United Nations scale.

The tremendous offensive of the Red Army on the Eastern Front, the Casablanca Conference, the prospects for an early opening of the Second Front, with its promise of victory, have brought consternation into the camp of the defeatist and anti-Soviet elements. A renewed anti-Soviet drive, to a great extent inspired by the intelligence department of the Nazi government through its secret agents, is developing in our country on a scale that reminds one of the anti-Soviet hysteria of 1939-40. Its main purpose is to weaken and disrupt the unity of the United Nations and weaken the possibilities of an early victory over Hitler.

To defeat this plot aimed at disuniting the forces of the United Na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, the complete unity of all labor in the United States and the unity of American, British and Soviet trade union movements is imperative. A genuine committee of representatives of the labor movement, in collaboration with authorized representatives of the European underground movements, could make a real contribution toward hammering out a clear-cut policy on the war and post-war problems, to guarantee international post-war cooperation and a people's peace. The vital need for such unified labor action can be seen from the effort that has been made during the past eight months by the British Trade Union Congress, the Soviet and Latin American trade unions, to establish a unified body of the labor movements of the United Nations.

But the "American Labor Conference on International Affairs" will lead neither to the unification of labor, nor to the strengthening of the war program of the United Nations. The conference carries no guarantee for a speedy victory over Hitler. It not only fails to answer the need of the hour, but, on the contrary, presents a serious danger to the American labor movement and to our nation.

In announcing the formation of this conference, Green stated:

"In it recognized spokesmen of organized labor in the United States will cooperate with representatives of the European labor movement residing in the United States of America and with American and European scholars to study war and post-war problems and evolve attitudes toward them on which the American and free European labor movements can agree."

Judging by those who are already on the committee, it becomes clear that "the representatives of the European labor movement" will not be men and women authorized by the united underground movement of France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Poland, etc., where Socialist and Communist trade unions are struggling unitedly against Hitler and Mussolini. Rather, these so-called European "representatives" will be anti-Soviet and anti-unity emigrés disconnected from the European countries.

Raphael Abramowitch, a top leader of the new organization, in an article in the Soviet-hating *Jewish Daily Forward* on February 15, spoke of "the varied composition of the new organization, that does not seek to be a 'front organization' of a party, nor an organization of one definite tendency, but one that embraces all of the most important ideological trends represented in the American and European democratic labor movement." He declared himself against admitting into the organization "people who belong to the anti-democratic dictator wing of the labor movement, because this organzation has the aim to study the international problems and to work out plans for the future proceeding from the liberating democratic point of view."

Here we have the meat in a nutshell. All organizations that stand for complete national and international unity in the war effort are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" 'front organizations' of a party," all those who work for full cooperation between the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States in the post-war period are "anti-democratic dictator" forces; while all labor-splitting and anti-Soviet elements become the "liberating democratic" wing!

This committee, while organized with the participation of such pro-war labor leaders as William Green, George M. Harrison of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, and Clinton S. Golden of the C.I.O., was actually conceived and planned by the clique of professional anti-Soviet conspirators of the *Jewish Daily Forward* which dominates the Social-Democratic Federation, the Workmen's Circle, several trade unions, the Jewish Labor Committee, and the *New Leader*. The real aim of this behind-the-scenes clique is to create a political center for conspiracy against any effort at the unification of labor in America and internationally. This committee is to become an instrument for collaborating with the Munichmen in America in their efforts to disrupt the Anglo-Soviet-American Alliance and to prevent a full victory of the United Nations.

By building up the committee, this clique attempts to trap some well-meaning labor leaders. It sets out to establish a conspiratorial center of the most dangerous nature, and, with the help of those labor leaders, to ensnare the American labor movement and make it a force for the disruption of the war effort now, and an instrument in defeating the aspirations of the peoples of America and Europe for a people's peace. The anti-Soviet Alter-Ehrlich hysteria was but one example of this.

An analysis of the composition of this committee will tell without need for speculation what attitudes it will evolve.

Who, in addition to the win-the-war facade of Messrs, Green, Harrison, Golden, and Lyons, are the leading lights of organized labor on this committee? Who are the representatives of the European labor movement? Who are the scholars?

They are, in the main, anti-Soviet emigrés in America; they are reactionary Soviet-baiters within the American labor movement; they are vicious anti-Soviet and Trotskyite intellectuals; they are the die-hard false-Socialists and Red-baiters of the Social-Democratic clique, the motive power behind this committee.

Among the intellectuals on the committee are:

Professor John Dewey, head of the committee that sought vainly to whitewash Trotsky.

Harry Gideonse, President of Brooklyn College, notorious for his activities in connection with the infamous Rapp-Coudert Committee.

Sidney Hook, a discredited Trotskyite, anti-Marxist "theoretician" and arch-enemy of socialism and the Soviet Union.

Algernon Lee, member of the leading committee of the Social-Democratic Federation, irreconcilable enemy of the Soviet Union, and Red-baiter of the most rabid type.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William Bohn, editor of the pseudo-Socialist Social-Democratic sheet, the *New Leader*.

Harry Laidler, a close associate of the defeatist Norman Thomas.

Friedrich Stampfer, a German Social-Democratic emigre of the Noske type, who has a record as an irreconcilable foe of unity of the trade union and working class political movement in the pre-Hitler days, and who has continued his anti-Soviet attacks and activities since he has been in this country.

Raphael Abramowitch, emigré Menshevik, a leading member of the Second International and an active counter-revolutionary for the past twenty-five years, is the so-called theoretician of the anti-Soviet Social-Democratic group. Abramowitch, immediately after the birth of the Soviet State, became a central figure in counter-revolutionary activities and has ceaselessly worked for the overthrow of the Soviet Government.

* * *

And who are some of the American labor leaders in the "American Labor Conference on International Affairs"?

The vice-chairman of the committee is David Dubinsky, he to whom the newspapers of William Randolph Hearst, the notorious labor-baiting Lord of San Simeon, a man after Hitler's own heart, devoted pages of praise in a series of articles in 1939.

Mr. Dubinsky's position and activities on the basic issues of the war are illuminating. During the Soviet-Finnish war Mr. Dubinsky rushed to organize a committee to help Mannerheim-Finland, now openly the ally of Hitler. Ever since the Soviet Union was invaded he has missed no opportunity to attack the Soviet Union and to Red-bait every movement in the United States in support of the Red Army and the Soviet Union. When Russian War Relief was organized and Mr. Dubinsky was asked to participate in its work, he rushed to the press, denouncing the organization as a "Communist Front." His subsequent gestures of support to Russian War Relief, to which he was impelled by the pro-Soviet sentiment of the workers, proved but a maneuver.

Mr. Dubinsky flirted with the defeatist John L. Lewis when the latter conspired with William Hutcheson and Matthew Woll to put over an abortive unity move to maneuver this clique into the leadership of the American labor movement, to turn it from its course of full support for the war and the policy of President Roosevelt.

Together with Mr. Dubinsky on the roster of names is his vice-president and stooge, Luigi Antonini, who rules over the Italian dressmakers' local, the Italian-American Labor Committee, and is a leading light in the New York American Labor Party. Antonini was the chief organizer of the frame-up hysteria directed at the Communist Party and the Soviet Union in connection with the killing of Carlo Tresca.

This was a deliberately planned campaign to wreck the growing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

movement among all the Italian-American groups in support of the unity movement of Socialists, Communists and liberals in Italy. Mr. Antonini carries through the policies of his boss, Mr. Dubinsky, of Red-baiting, disruption, and anti-Soviet activities which lead to anti-war activities, irrespective of his professed support of the war.

Another of the labor members on the committee is Matthew Woll, Vice-President of the A. F. of L., formerly a member of the anti-labor Civic Federation, a collaborator of Ralph Easley, famous for his activities in labor spying. Matthew Woll is one of the most reactionary anti-New Dealers on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L., a Red-baiter of the worst kind, a collaborator of Mr. Hamilton Fish.

The real driving force behind this committee is the Social-Democratic Federation, which is dominated by a small *Jewish Daily Forward* clique. A handful of vicious anti-Soviet Red-baiters with an insignificant number of rank-and-file members, this clique is headed by Abraham Cahan, Hillel Rogoff, N. Chanin, David Dubinsky and Raphael Abramowitch. Their strategic positions enable them to impose their policies on labor bodies and on people's organizations and to speak in the name of the workers of these organizations, to terrorize leaders of the American trade union movement and of other sections of the population. In this way they have been able to hold back the development toward unity of American labor; to block the unity movement among the Jewish people of America; and to prevent a solid national front, against the appeaser, defeatist, pro-Hitler forces in America.

There are thousands of workers with a Social-Democratic background to whom this top group refers as their followers. These Social-Democratic workers, together with the Communists and their followers and all other class-conscious, advanced trade unionists, constitute an advance section of the American labor movement. These trade unionists of all political shadings are true American patriots. They are anti-fascist. They are for all-out and concentrated war effort. They stand behind the President and his war program. They are all true friends and admirers of the Soviet Union.

They are eager to see close collaboration among the United States, Great Britain and the Soviet Union now in the war against Hitler and after victory is achieved. They fully agree with the general policies of Philip Murray and William Green in their support of the President and his war program. They are for labor unity and for the unity of the American, British and Soviet trade unions. While this is the thinking and sentiment of all trade unionists, Social-Democratic workers included, the small group of Social-Democratic die-hards on top are carrying through an exactly opposite policy. Proof of this is the fact that in most cases the leadership did not dare bring its Alter-Ehrlich anti-Soviet campaign to the membership of the I.L.G. W.U. locals, and where it did it met

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with strong resistance on the part of the membership.

This clique is consistently anti-Soviet, to the detriment of our American national interests. They are opposed to labor unity for fear that this would consolidate labor as the spearhead of national unity behind the President's war program, including the Roosevelt-Molotov Agreement and the decision of the Casablanca Conference for opening the Second Front. They are opposed to international labor unity, fearing a powerful international labor alliance with the Soviet trade unions included.

With their new committee, this clique seeks to extend its disruptive activities on a permanent national and international scale to prevent the people from expressing themselves now and to check the people of the European countries when the time comes for them to decide on their way of life after the war. This is the true meaning and purpose of the "American Labor Conference on International Affairs."

* * *

For further evidence of the true motives of the Social-Democratic Federation in planning this new organization, let us look into the activities of Abe Cahan, Rogoff and Chanin, the infamous anti-Soviet trio in the so-called Socialist movement.

Abe Cahan, editor-in-chief of the *Jewish Daily Forward,* is the father of Hearstian yellow gutter-journalism in the American-Jewish newspaper and literary world. At every critical period in the American labor and Socialist movement, this man has been on the side of the anti-people's reactionary and counter-revolutionary forces. At every turn of history, he has not failed to be recorded on the debit side of progress.

Hillel Rogoff, managing editor of the *Jewish Daily Forward,* is a petty careerist and a renegade. A weak, unprincipled man who hesitated for years on his attitude toward the Soviet Union, shifting from one position to another, undecided on the location of the bandwagon—the pro-Soviet or anti-Soviet side. Thus, in 1922 it appeared to him that he stood to gain more by coming over to the pro-Soviet forces. He joined M. J. Olgin and Louis Engdahl, in the second split within the Socialist Party, and together with them joined the Workers Party. Within a few weeks, however, before committing himself too much, he found his way back to the *Forward* camp. Since then he has continued as Red-baiter, reactionary and isolationist. Although Messrs. Cahan and Rogoff are not members of the new organization, their spirit and counsel carry much weight behind the scenes.

Chanin is the most brazenly outspoken of these Soviet-baiters. He became secretary of the Jewish Socialist Federation after the second split in the Socialist Party. Chanin is the organization man of this clique. He whips into line everyone who deviates in the slightest from the policies of the clique. Should any official of a trade union or other organization become favorably inclined toward the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union and toward unity within the American labor movement, Mr. Chanin will make sure that such an official is either "clarified" or kicked out. In 1929 Chanin issued an appeal for funds in the name of the "Auxiliary Committee of the Social-Democratic Labor Party and Bund in Russia," which read in part:

"You know of the difficult struggle our comrades carry on in Russia against Bolshevism . . . Just now, when the Communist dictatorship experiences a crisis . . . it is particularly important that the secret Social-Democratic cells now at work in Russia should not cease, but should grow stronger and strike deeper roots. . . ."

Chanin concerns himself not only with anti-Soviet disruptive activities in America, but, as his writings indicate, with counter-revolutionary forces abroad.

In the *Friend*, official organ of the Workmen's Circle, Chanin contributes a regular feature, "Letter to a Friend," whom he addresses as "Chaim." However, when one reads the letter to "Chaim" in the *Friend* for January, 1942, questions begin to rise in one's mind about the character and activities of this supposedly fictitious man (or men?) "Chaim" and about the advice given him. We read in that letter:

"Do you remember what history recounts of Napoleon's march on Russia? At that time the Czar, who held the Russian people in slavery, ruled. And yet their heroism broke Napoleon's might, not only on the Russian front, but in all of Europe. The same thing happened in the war that Russia waged nearly a century ago against Turkey. Now too, the war will be won, not by Stalin, not by the Soviet regime, but by the Russian people. The war against Hitler will be won by America and England, the two free countries. The last shot has not yet been fired; it is yet to be fired, and the final shot will come from free America—and from this last shot the Stalin regme will be shot to pieces."

What is this but the fomenting of counter-revolutionary plots against America's most powerful and most dependable ally? And this, at a time when the Soviet Union, its people, its Red Army, and its leadership, by their heroism, endurance, courage and self-sacrifice are inspiring the whole human race in its desperate fight against enslavement!

Imagine this Chanin in the Soviet Union, attempting to develop activities along the lines of his writings and speeches, then change his name to Alter or Ehrlich, and you will understand the treason for which the Quisling friends of Chanin were executed. This is Mr. Chanin, one of the clique controlling the *Jewish Daily Forward* and the Jewish Labor Committee. His are the policies that will dominate the "American Labor Conference on International Affairs."

* * *

During the past three and a half years the Jewish Labor Committee has been very active in collecting funds to bring Social-Democratic, Socialist-Revolutionary and Polish-Jewish Social-Democratic Bundist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political refugees from abroad. The job of these "refugees" here is to help in the Red-baiting anti-Soviet propaganda, to bolster up anti-Soviet feeling among the Social-Democratic workers who are turning with ever greater sympathy and solidarity toward the Soviet Union.

Raphael Abramowitch is one of these political refugees. Victor Chernow is another. Chernow is a Russian counter-revolutionary emigré, who, according to the anti-Nazi publication, *The Hour*, has been in close touch with Ukrainian fascists in America. This Mr. Chernow, in the early days of the October Revolution, formed in Prague a "League of Peoples of Eastern Europe" which embraced all separatists hostile to the new Russia and agitators clamoring for the dismemberment of the Soviet Union. He also organized at that time the so-called "Union of Socialist-Revolutionaries." The main activity of that organization consisted of collaborating with separatists of all kinds, with the aim of dismembering the Soviet Union.

For a number of years Chernow was closely associated in Europe with Nikifor Grigorieff, Ukrainian anti-Semitic propagandist. In 1928 Chernow took part with Grigorieff in a conference held in Prague to discuss "the question" of neutral relationship among the peoples of Eastern Europe. The conference was anti-Soviet in its purposes; but it masqueraded under the banner of "liberation" of various Soviet Republics.

On one of his trips to the United States Chernow established contact with Luke Myshuha in the office of the notorious Nazi-minded Ukrainian newspaper, *Svoboda*. Myshuha has for a number of years maintained ties with Axis agents and in 1939 delivered a speech in Germany over the Nazi radio network.

When he came to settle in the United States, Chernow immediately plunged into activity in company with the same camp of separatists and anti-Semites with whom he had been connected in the past. In December, 1941, an organization called the "Committee for the Promotion of Democracy" was formed. Among the individuals connected with the committee were Nikifor Grigorieff, Victor Chernow, and F. J. Bogocius. Bogocius was associated with a pro-Nazi Lithuanian-language publication *Kelievis*, which refers in its headlines to Jews as "stinking kikes."

The Hour, for December 13, 1941, published an exposé of this so-called Committee for the Promotion of Democracy. Instantly the gentlemen of the Social-Democratic Federation, the Jewish Labor Committee, and the *New Leader* launched an attack on the editor of *The Hour* as a "Communist Fronter," thereby attempting to "cover up" for Chernow, Grigorieff and Co. Similar attacks on *The Hour* appeared in fascist-minded publications, like *Kelievis* and the Brooklyn *Tablet*. In January, 1942, the gentlemen of the Jewish Labor Committee called a special luncheon which was attended by William Bohn, editor of, and Alfred Baker Lewis, contributor to, the *New Leader;* Emil Schlesinger, counsel

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the Jewish Labor Committee, and for Mr. Dubinsky and the I.L.G.W.U.; Isaiah Minkoff, Social-Democratic director of the General Jewish Council; Charles Sherman, then secretary of the Jewish Labor Committee; Adolph Held, chairman of the Jewish Labor Committee; and Frank Trager, Trotskyite functionary of the American Jewish Committee; and a few other individuals.

This luncheon was held to discuss the exposé in *The Hour* and to decide upon action against the publication. Subsequently the chiefs of the Jewish Labor Committee helped Chernow and Grigorieff to file libel suits against *The Hour*.

This is but one instance of the politically shady activities of the Jewish Labor Committee and the Social-Democratic Federation. And if one wonders how it is possible for two Jews and "Socialists" like Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter to conspire and work against the Soviet Union in the interests of Hitler-Germany, we need but take a good look at the activities of their prototypes in the U.S.A.

While importing, encouraging and protecting elements that work for unity among anti-Soviet and even fascist groups, this clique is a bitter foe of unity of the international labor movement. When Sir Walter Citrine came to America last year to negotiate for the unity of the American, British and Soviet trade unions, it was this Social-Democratic group that called a special conclave of picked diehard leaders. At that gathering they took Citrine severely to task. He was charged with trying to build up the prestige of the Soviet trade unions and the Communists in the American trade union movement. He was told they would exert all efforts to make sure that his mission was a failure. This they achieved. The Social-Democrat Dubinsky, in league with Matthew Woll and Hutcheson of the A. F. of L. Executive Council, defeated the Citrine proposal for unity, to the great detriment of world labor. And to achieve the same disruptive anti-unity aims on a national and world scale is the objective of this new organization.

These people play the same disruptive role in American Jewish life.

The Jewish masses in America are deeply moved by the plight of the Jews in occupied Europe. They cherish the Red Army and the Soviet Union as the liberator and protector of races and peoples. As Jews, as American patriots concerned with the fate of our own nation, all circles of American Jewish life are moving toward unity within the Jewish community and are among the staunchest supporters of national unity in America. The diehard Social-Democrats, however, attack every effort toward unity. Their hearts are particularly heavy at the thought of victory over the Axis, with the Soviet Union in a leading role. A Second Front in Europe now, which would realize fully the fighting coalition of the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain, does not at all fit in with their hopes and plans for the isolation of the Soviet Union. Hence their renewed anti-Soviet drive, co-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inciding with the "Bolshevik-menace" campaign resumed by Hitler, and developed in the United States by the defeatists and appeasers.

A speedy conclusion of the war does not correspond with the plans of the Social-Democratic elements. Their idea is to have a long-drawn-out war with the hope that the Soviet people will be worn out by the protracted warfare. They base their strategy on the hopes that a drawn-out war may develop disagreements, friction and hostilities among the United Nations, and a coalition and armed intervention against the Soviet Union. This is the objective for which they have been working since the birth of the Soviet Union. This is the "Socialist" dream of Chanin, Rogoff, Cahan, Abramowitch and Co.

These plans and hopes, often in veiled forms, find expression in their speeches and writings. On July 6, 1942, Abramowitch wrote in the *Jewish Daily Forward*, in an article entitled "A Long War or a Short One?":

"The only chance for the democracies to win the war and not to be defeated is to bring about a situation of prolonged war. This means that the only correct tactic of the unprepared democracies first and foremost is to win time."

Here we have Hoover under a "Socialist" mantle! But Abramowitch was in advance of Hoover. He proposed this defeatist wait-and-delay policy actually ahead of Hoover.

Quite clearly, we are dealing here with a group of Social-Democrats who remain unmoved by the world catastrophe, by human tragedy, by courage and sacrifice. They remain the same counter-revolutionary, anti-Soviet interventionist wrecking force, the same die-hard disrupters of the unity of the working class and the nation as those who paved the way for Hitlerism.

On June 21, 1942, Abramowitch wrote a series of articles in the *Jewish Daily Forward* polemizing against certain British Socialists. He took issue with the prominent British Socialist G. D. H. Cole, who had stated that "the European Socialists dare not permit the differences with Communists on matters of principle to become a basis for deep antagonisms" and to block collaboration of the European Socialist movements with the Soviet Union. Said Abramowitch:

"British Socialism is the only one of the big Socialist movements of the pre-war period that has remained a living mass power in a democratic state. All other big labor parties in Europe have disappeared in the war—all except those in Sweden and Switzerland, which are small countries."

In the *Jewish Daily Forward* of June 28, 1942, Abramowitch took issue with another British Socialist, Harold Laski, who had written:

"No single report at the Conference [of the British Labor Party] evoked such tremendous applause as the information about the intention of the Executive Committee to request the Soviet Government to receive a Socialist delegation with the object of reaching a full under-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing between the Russian and British Labor movement.

"This enthusiasm not only expressed a recognition of the achievements of the heroic Soviet Army, it also expressed the realization that the two most important Socialist movements of the world must reach a full agreement as a pre-condition for a future peace."

This position is, needless to say, unacceptable to Mr. Abramowitch, and he protests against it vehemently, branding it as detrimental, unrealistic and impossible. He attempts to refute the arguments of the British Socialists for unity with the Soviet Union. He repeats his slanders against the Soviet Union as a "totalitarian" state with whom "Socialists" have nothing in common.

Abramowitch and his clique realize that the old Socialist Second International as an anti-Soviet center is falling to pieces, that the European Social-Democratic movements, the British Labor Party together with three presidents of the Second International, having learned from the bitter experiences of the past period, are orientating on a policy of full collaboration with the Soviet Union. From this policy Abramowitch and his colleagues bitterly dissent. They are therefore proceeding to set up a new political "international labor center" in America designed to take over the dishonorable task of the interventionists, wreckers and saboteurs of the good old days.

The "American Labor Conference on International Affairs" is nothing but an attempt to set up a world anti-Soviet center. This organization is the spearhead of a planned campaign of slander and vilification against the Soviet Union, exactly when the American people have come to feel close ties of comradeship with the Soviet Union.

The anti-Soviet drive around the Tresca murder case, the campaign of slander and provocation that took as its pretext the execution of Alter and Ehrlich—these are but part of the diabolical scheme that these conspirators are now concocting to disrupt the relations of our country with our Soviet Ally.

This Social-Democratic clique is attempting to unify all that is rotten and vicious in American labor and intellectual circles and all the vicious elements that have been discredited in the eyes of labor and the peoples of Europe, to create a political "labor" anti-unity, anti-Soviet center. It wants to drag American labor into its swamp of reaction and counter-revolution in the very midst of our nation's war for survival and for liberation, in fighting coalition with our Soviet, British and other Allies, of the whole world from fascist enslavement.

* * *

Labor should be warned against this spurious "American Labor Conference," which is anti-American as it is anti-labor. Labor should be warned against making our country and our trade union movement the center for anti-Soviet intrigue.

Those win-the-war labor leaders who are antagonistic toward Communists and Communism should

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realize that, by associating and collaborating with these anti-Soviet elements, they are playing into the hands of the disrupters of our country's war efforts; that they are weakening the unity of the United Nations, and are endangering our victory. They should realize the danger of permitting their anti-Communist prejudices to draw them away from the logical course of national unity and united labor action for winning the war, and of allowing themselves to be drawn into the defeatist camp through this pernicious anti-Soviet center.

All true American trade unionists, loyal to labor and to the nation, are striving for the speediest realization of international labor solidarity with the trade unions of Great Britain and the Soviet Union. Unity of labor, nationally and internationally, unity of the United Nations, are the guarantee for victory and a just peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forthcoming "International" Books

THE PROBLEM OF INDIA
By R. Palme Dutt

The long-awaited book by Britain's distinguished Marxist, generally regarded as the most authoritative and comprehensive study of India today. The author, for over twenty years the editor of the British **Labor Monthly**, has added a new introduction for the American edition, clarifying the problem of Hindu-Moslem unity in the light of India's struggle for national unity and independence in the interests of victory over the Axis.

Price $1.50

SOCIALISM AND ETHICS
By Prof. Howard Selsam

A vital study, by the author of **What Is Philosophy?**, of man's ethics and moral judgments, the origins of human concepts of "right" and "wrong," and the social-historical roots and economic foundations of modern social conventions and relationships. These are traced through various stages of civilization up to the modern era of capitalism and socialism, showing the influence of the economic systems of each upon their social superstructures.

Price $1.90

LABOR AND THE WAR
Prepared by Labor Research Association

A handbook on labor problems in connection with the war, containing a veritable arsenal of valuable information on production and conditions in the basic war industries, manpower problems, war economy, the various war boards and commissions, trade union organizations, labor relations and labor legislation, international labor unity, etc. Prepared as the sixth volume in the **Labor Fact Book** series, it is indexed for handy reference.

Price $1.25

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Appeal to "All of the People"

"I'm going to talk about the Second Front.

"The Second Front is no military secret. We all know that, just over the horizon, we of the United Nations are piling up the thunder-clouds of the greatest attack in history. We are massing for that attack, now. The planning, the patient preparation, the bitter time when we had to take blows without returning them, because we weren't ready—all of that is past. Now we're ready to deal a few blows ourselves; and they'll be blows, I can promise you, that will rock Nazi Germany to its rotten, blood-stained foundations.

"As the Secretary of the Treasury I've been given the job of seeing to it that money is available to pay for this great military offensive and others to follow. That is why we are launching the Second War Loan . . . to raise at least $13,000,000,000 before the end of this month to buy the materials and implements of war. We must buy shells today for big guns that will be roaring tomorrow and the day after. I'm here . . . to tell you that your help is needed. The need is real, urgent, pressing. . . .

"This is a people's war—so all of the people ought to have a part in financing it."

—HENRY W. MORGENTHAU, Jr.
April 12, 1943

This space donated
by the publishers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED